University of Alberta

A Materialist Feminist Analysis of Dorothy Livesay, Madge Macbeth, and the Canadian Literary Field, 1920-1950.

by

Peggy Kelly

©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Department of English

Edmonton, Alberta
Fall 1999

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-46864-X

Canadä

University of Alberta
Library Release Form

Name of Author: Peggy Kelly

Title of Thesis: **A Materialist-Feminist Analysis of Dorothy Livesay, Madge Macbeth, and the Canadian Literary Field, 1920-1950.**

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Year this Degree Granted: Fall 1999

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly, or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as herein before provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Peggy Kelly

402-8607 106A Street NW
Edmonton, AB T6E 4J8
Canada

September 30, 1999

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled **A Materialist-Feminist Analysis of Dorothy Livesay, Madge Macbeth, and the Canadian Literary Field, 1920-1950** submitted by Peggy Kelly in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Dr. Paul Hjartarson

Dr. Jo-Ann Wallace

Dr. Teresa Zackodnik

Dr. Carole Gerson

Dr. Nasrin Rahimieh

September 9, 1999

TO MY PARENTS

Abstract

Drawing on materialist feminist theories, theories of nationalisms, and Pierre Bourdieu's cultural materialist theories, this feminist cultural history turns to the politics and writing of two Canadian women writers, Dorothy Livesay (1909-1996) and Madge Macbeth (1878-1965), as a means of focusing the major issues of the field. Articulations between nationalism, internationalism, and continentalism, between internationalism and modernism, and between modernism and Victorianism are addressed through a consideration of the debates circulating within literary circles of the period. An examination of the articulation of institutions, politics, power relations, and the economy with the literary field and with writers' position-takings reveals the systemic marginalization of women in this field. The differing works and lives of these two writers illustrate the various positions available to middle-class Canadian women writers on the popular-literature/literary-writing continuum and in the Canadian literary field of 1920-1950. Livesay's poetry, Macbeth's fiction, and the journalism, correspondence, and speeches of both reveal the strategies they employed to negotiate the politics of a literary field based on masculinist assumptions. In addition, the process of the construction of the canon is examined through a survey of thirty-eight anthologies published between 1923 and 1957. Through Livesay and Macbeth, this project historicizes the canon and questions the oppositions that are often attributed to the popular-literature/literary-writing binary.

Acknowledgements

I wish to extend my sincere appreciation to my supervisor, Paul Hjartarson, for his guidance through the process of thinking through and producing this dissertation, and for his careful editing. Professor Hjartarson's dedication to an analytical method that examines the articulations of politics, race, economics, art, and literatures of the 1920s has been an inspiration for my work on Canadian women writers of later decades. The helpful comments I received from the other members of my committee, Jo-Ann Wallace and Teresa Zackodnik, especially on the theoretical and structural aspects of this dissertation, are gratefully appreciated. I also want to thank Carole Gerson for sharing her research materials on Madge Macbeth, Tara Curtis for providing me with a copy of her thesis on Macbeth, and Cecily Devereux for sharing her ideas and writing on the New Woman.

Thanks to the staff of the following archives for their cheerful and efficient assistance: National Archives of Canada; City Archives and Corporate Resource Centre of Ottawa; Statistics Canada Library; Bruce Peel Special Collections and Rutherford Libraries, University of Alberta; Department of Archives and Special Collections, Elizabeth Dafoe Library, University of Manitoba.

This dissertation has been funded by scholarships from the University of Alberta and the Social Sciences and the Humanities Research Council of Canada. I am grateful for their generous support. The University of Alberta and the University of Manitoba deserve my further thanks for providing me with travel grants to perform research for this project.

List of Tables

Table 1:
Academic-Professional Anthologies, 1923-1957 206

Table 2:
Association Anthologies, 1929-1952 207

Table 3: Summary 207

Notes to Tables 208

Introduction

This project grew out of a graduate course, "Canadian Literature, Culture, and Society in the 1920s," taught by Professor Paul Hjartarson. In that course, I read Pierre Bourdieu's cultural theories and applied them to Dorothy Livesay's early poetry. I was immediately hooked; I found the period fascinating, Livesay's life and work inspiring, and Bourdieu's theories challenging. During the preliminary research for this dissertation's proposal, I read Carole Gerson's 1992 essay, "The Business of a Woman's Life: Money and Motive in the Careers of Early Canadian Women Writers." Gerson closes with "the image of Madge Macbeth as the consummate professional woman author," the first mention I had ever seen of Macbeth in print (93). I read Macbeth's works and decided to compare her and Livesay as widely divergent examples of the positions available to Canadian women writers in the middle of the twentieth century. I was struck by the range of attitudes, values, forms, subjects, and politics appearing in the lives and writing of these two women. I believed that a comparison of their politics and dispositions[1] would allow me to suggest the range of possibilities open to other members of the Canadian literary field.

Dorothy Kathleen Livesay (1909-1996) was born in Winnipeg and raised in Toronto. She moved to Vancouver in 1936, married Duncan Cameron Macnair in 1937, and raised their son, Peter, and daughter, Marcia, in Vancouver. Livesay was a highly educated woman who studied at the University of Toronto, the Sorbonne, the University of British Columbia, and the University of London, where she acquired degrees in modern languages and literatures, social work, and education. After the death of her husband in 1959, Livesay lived in England, France, Zambia (Northern Rhodesia), and in cities across Canada. She spent her senior years in Victoria and on Galiano Island, British Columbia. Between 1926 and her death in 1996, Livesay wrote and published twenty-one collections of poetry, one novel, one autobiography, as well as many short stories, articles, book reviews, and plays for radio and stage. The huge quantity of Livesay's poetic output over her lifetime continues to supply scholars and publishers with material after her death: *Archive For Our Times*, published two years after Livesay's death, is a collection of poetry culled mainly from her papers. Moreover, Livesay cofounded two poetry journals and one political journal; she also edited two anthologies of poetry by Canadian women, and a collection of Raymond Knister's poetry.[2] The themes of Livesay's writing range from nature, human relationships, and sexuality to historical events, injustice, trade unions, and racism. Her rapid transition from imagist poet to socially engaged writer was typical of the radicalization experienced by many middle- class writers during the Great Depression. Livesay's commitment to low modernist poetry offers an early example of this radicalization in Canada.[3]

Madge Hamilton Lyons Macbeth (1878-1965)[4] was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, but lived in Canada from her teenage years when she moved to London, Ontario, to complete her secondary education. After her graduation, Macbeth spent a few years performing as a mandolinist before marrying Charles William Macbeth in 1901. They had two children, Charles and Douglas, who were both young when their father died prematurely from tuberculosis. Macbeth did not remarry. She lived the rest of her long life in Ottawa, where she was active in the Ottawa Little Theatre, the Canadian Authors Association (CAA), and the Canadian Women's Press Club. She began her literary career in the field of journalism, by selling photographs and interviews of public figures to Canadian magazines; she also worked for other journalists by taking photographs for their articles. Macbeth's first published short story, "Frieda's Engagement: A Monologue," appeared in the *Canadian Magazine* in 1908, and has been reprinted in *New Women: Short Stories by Canadian Women 1900-1920*, edited by Sandra Campbell and Lorraine McMullen. Her first novel, *The Winning Game*, a melodrama about alcoholism and betrayal among the American idle rich, was published in 1910. Macbeth wrote twenty books and countless articles, short stories, book reviews, and speeches. In addition, she travelled extensively and wrote travel literature based on her experiences. Her fiction ranges from adventure-romance to social and political satire to feminist polemic to *l'écriture au féminin*. Moreover, Macbeth was a great humourist; her entire oeuvre is marked by this talent, especially her speeches, social satire, and drama. Although Macbeth was a prominent figure in the Canadian literary field of 1920-1950 through her leadership role in the CAA, her writing is no longer widely available.

A Materialist-Feminist Analysis of Dorothy Livesay, Madge Macbeth, and the Canadian Literary Field of 1920-1950 draws on concepts from feminist theories, cultural studies, and the sociology of literature to analyze the major issues circulating in this field. I follow Stuart Hall's and Jennifer Slack's practice of analyzing the relations of power operating within culture and politics, and I appropriate Pierre Bourdieu's concepts, especially cultural capital, artistic generations, and symbolic violence, to apply this cultural studies approach to literary fields. The materialist-feminist theories of Rosemary Hennessy, Sandra Harding, and Teresa Ebert figure largely in my appropriation of cultural studies theories and Bourdieu's methodology to a feminist literary criticism. Materialist-feminist theories provide the foundation for addressing the ways in which masculinist assumptions and the popular-literature/literary-writing binary shaped the Canadian literary field of 1920-1950. In addition, feminist theories are helpful for discussing systemic exclusionary practices based on professional status, gender, class, race, and ethnicity. In the case of women writers, many of whom struggle to accommodate families and writing, professional status may be difficult to attain and to maintain, and this difficulty affects decisions made concerning the literary canon. Livesay's work is included in the Canadian literary canon but Macbeth's work has been marginalized.

Throughout this project, I emphasize the context of Livesay's and Macbeth's positions and decisions within the literary field as well as the articulation of the literary field with the larger social, economic, and political contexts of Canada. I am interested in Canadian writers' relationships to the political and economic hegemony: the ways in which Livesay, Macbeth, and their contemporaries participated in, or contested, the dominant ideology of the field of power of their period.[5] The comparison in Chapter 1 of the lives and work of Livesay and Macbeth serves as a jumping-off point for my analysis of the Canadian literary field and the major issues that concerned Canadian writers. In the 1920-1950 period, tensions between nationalism, continentalism, and internationalism circulate in Canadian society and are replicated in the literary field through struggles over literary standards, the definition of a national literature, the evaluation of modernist and

Victorian literatures, and the construction of a literary canon. Livesay and Macbeth were involved in these struggles through their memberships in the CAA, their literary criticism, their public speeches, and their journalism. The choices they make in their life writing, poetry, and fiction reflect their positions on these and other issues. I examine their writings as a means of isolating variations in the positions taken by Canadian writers on contemporary issues. In the following pages, I do not present a close textual reading; rather, I take certain concepts from cultural studies and Bourdieu to develop a feminist reading of the relations of power that faced the women writers of this period in Canada.

In Chapter 2, I outline the critical and theoretical methodologies, cultural materialism and feminist theories, which I have found useful in the development of this project. In the cultural materialism section, I discuss Bourdieu's application of sociological methodology to the field of cultural production and my version of a feminist engagement with Bourdieu's theoretical model. Secondly, I examine the broad dichotomy between popular literature and pure art and its operation in the Canadian literary field of 1920-1950. In the feminist theories section, I develop the discussion of standpoint theory that begins in Chapter 1; I examine the terminology and methodology related to materialist feminism; and I explain my reasons for adopting this theory and terminology. In this section, I also outline theories of the nation and of nationalism, their masculinist foundations, and the ways in which feminists have theorized nationalism.

In Chapter 3, I examine the role of cultural nationalists in the Canadian literary field of 1920-1950. First, I situate nationalists in relation to the establishment and I outline the impact of contintentalism on the development of Canadian educational and cultural institutions. Second, I discuss Livesay's and Macbeth's interpellations and position-takings in relation to nationalism, especially the way in which Macbeth reproduces, in her Canadian journalism, the intersections of imperialist ideology with class and gender in the discourse of domestic science, and the way in which Livesay resists racism. This chapter functions to set the scene for the following chapters, by providing an historical overview of the institutions with which Livesay, Macbeth, and other Canadian writers had to contend during this period.

In Chapter 4, I outline the rise of modernism as a masculinist Western cultural movement; I consider the ways in which internationalism and modernism articulate;[6] and I argue against literary historians who claim that modernism appeared in the Canadian literary field thirty years after it was established in the European and American literary fields. I analyze the debate between Canadian cultural nationalists and cultural internationalists over the existence of a national literature and its potential value to the task of nation-building in Canada, and I position Livesay and Macbeth within this debate. I discuss Macbeth's modernist novel *Shackles* (1926), and Livesay's political and literary transition from imagist poetry to low modernist poetry. Finally, I argue that Canadian writers on the political left, through their defence of cosmopolitanism, internationalism, and Anglo-American literary standards, were unwitting supporters of the political-economic hegemony.

Chapters 3 and 4 are closely related; together they describe my view of the major power struggles in the Canadian literary field of 1920-1950, and the ways in which Livesay and Macbeth participate in, or are marginalized in relation to, these struggles. Both chapters are informed by assumptions integral to the popular-literature/pure-art continuum. For example, Canadian Book Week,[7] an institutional innovation of Canadian literary nationalists, was denigrated by Canadian internationalists partly because the latter group perceived such activities as contaminating literature by commodifying it. Internationalists, who agreed with nationalists on the need for the development of a national literature in Canada, worked toward this end by other means, such as their participation in international literary movements and their application of Anglo-American literary standards to Canadian literature. Internationalists failed to acknowledge the material benefits which accrued to all writers from the expansion of the Canadian literary market by literary nationalists such as Macbeth. In these two chapters, I examine nationalist and internationalist positions on the following questions: Is there a Canadian literature?; What is the best way to develop a national literature (through sales and education or through mimicry of the best in American and British literatures)?; Which literary standards are best for Canadian literature (local, national, continental, or international)?.

In Chapter 5, I locate Livesay within a model of three literary generations of Canadian modernist poets, and I critique the exclusion of Livesay's writing from *New Provinces: Poems of Several Authors* (1936). Questions of professionalization, the devaluation of feminine cultural products, and the political dispositions and position-takings of various players are central to this discussion. Finally, I analyze the results of a survey of anthologies published between 1923 and 1957. The results support my contention that canon-making activity related to the production of anthologies is heavily influenced by gendered binaries. My survey shows that the gender of the editor is an important factor in editorial decision making and that, as Bourdieu claims, the field of cultural production is highly competitive.

My project is an extension of the work of Canadian feminist literary archaeologist Carole Gerson, whose analysis of the Canadian literary field of the nineteenth and early twentieth-centuries provides an example that I am emulating here. Whereas, in her research and writing,[8] Gerson exposes the antifeminist bias inherent in Canadian literary practice by conducting an encyclopedic survey of the field, my decision to analyze the positions and position-takings of two very different women writers allows me to illustrate not only the range of the Canadian literary field but also the specifics of discriminatory practices and the strategies adopted by Livesay and Macbeth to mediate that discrimination. I draw on materialist-feminist methodology to perform my analysis. The work of Bridget Elliott and Jo-Ann Wallace on modernist British and American women writers and artists serves as a model of materialist-feminist practice. In *Women Artists and Writers: Modernist (im)positionings* (1994), Elliott and Wallace skilfully locate their writers and artists within structures of power and expose the systemic discrimination and double standards which function throughout the British and European fields of cultural production. Elliott's and Wallace's feminist materialism considers biographical fact, evidence of sexual politics, and textual analysis within cultural and economic contexts; I have adapted their methodology to this much smaller feminist project. For instance, in Chapter 5, I examine the material effects of gendered attitudes to professionalism on

Livesay's career trajectory. Through a feminist approach to my topic, I try to modify the canon-making power of Canadian literary history by exposing its masculinist assumptions.

Chapter 1

Differences in Similarities: A Comparison of Dorothy Livesay and Madge Macbeth Within the Canadian Literary Field, 1920-1950

We're never the same person, you know. Every decade we become a different person. (Livesay in Barber 19)

On December 14, 1945, Lorne Pierce, cultural nationalist and literary editor for Ryerson Press, wrote to Dorothy Livesay (1909-1996) to inform her that Madge Macbeth (1878-1965) had accepted Livesay's Governor-General's Literary Award on her behalf at the Canadian Authors Association's (CAA) annual meeting in Montreal. Since the CAA administered the Governor-General's Awards from their inception in 1936 until the Canada Council took over in 1960, and since Macbeth was a major figure in the CAA, this is not the bizarre coincidence that it may initially appear to be; however, Pierce was annoyed by it. He planned to attend the meeting to accept the award on Livesay's behalf because she could not afford to travel from Vancouver, but, as he wrote to Livesay, "there was a mistake in the date" (UA 96-69 Box 1 File 1928-1952 December 14, 1945).[9] Pierce requested that F.R. Scott (1899-1985), a contemporary of Livesay's, accept the medal on her behalf. After the affair was over, Pierce described the mix-up in his letter to Livesay:

> But Rod Kennedy [President of the CAA 1945-1947], who had got the wrong date on the telegram, and who had left his room without the medal (only to have it retrieved by Clay [Secretary of the CAA] and who reached the head table at almost the moment of presentation leaving the medal behind the second time to be retrieved by Clay, fumbled again and called on Madge McBeth [sic] to receive it on behalf of the Author and The Ryerson Press. It all sounds incredible. (December 14, 1945)

Pierce's disappointment in Kennedy for his disorganization and choice of Macbeth to accept Livesay's medal hinges on the very different literary and political trajectories of these two Canadian women. The rare occurrence of a material connection between Livesay and Macbeth, even as remote as this one, represents their differences within similarities. Macbeth and Livesay operated in the same literary field, in the same time frame, and faced similar literary decisions as well as discrimination on the basis of sex, but they were neither allies nor friends. There is no archival evidence of correspondence between them. Scott, who was instrumental in excluding Livesay from *New Provinces: Poems of Several Authors* (1936), the only anthology of modernist Canadian poetry to be published during the Great Depression, was closer in both the political and literary sense to Livesay than was Macbeth. Livesay and Macbeth belonged to different chronological and artistic generations and they chose different literary paths. Livesay dedicated her life to poetry, a genre that seldom provides an income, and to political activism, which her early reportage and later journalism served. Macbeth wrote little poetry but was a financially successful producer of nonpolemical journalism, drama, and fiction. Although Livesay's achievement of the Governor-General's Award indicates her elevated status in the Canadian literary field of 1945, Macbeth held a different sort of cultural capital in the larger arena of popular literature. She was publicly involved in debates over the development of a national literature in Canada, and she was politically involved in the improvement of the Canadian literary field and market on behalf of the Canadian writer of popular literature.

Born in the late nineteenth century to Elizabeth Maffit Lyons and Hymen Hart Lyons, Macbeth was a daughter of the American aristocracy, a debutante who reported on the coming-out ceremonies of younger debutantes for the *Canadian Courier*.[10] Elizabeth Maffit's family were Anglo-Saxon Americans and H.H. Lyons descended from German Jews who immigrated to the United States in the late eighteenth century. Macbeth does not mention her Jewish ancestry in either of her memoirs, *Over My Shoulder* (1953), or *Boulevard Career* (1957).[11] Born just after the turn of the twentieth century, Livesay was the daughter of an upper-middle-class Canadian couple, John Frederick Bligh Livesay (1875-1944) and Florence Hamilton Randal Livesay (1874-1953), who were active in the Canadian literary scene. Fred Livesay, known to his family as Jeff, was himself an immigrant from Scotland, and Florence Randal was a Canadian of Anglo-Saxon heritage. Both families were able to afford servants, but Florence Livesay's freelance writing paid for their household help, while the Lyons' income was more established, deriving from land, politics, and business. Macbeth's maternal grandfather Maffit was Comptroller of the State of Maryland. Before H.H. Lyons' death from tuberculosis, Macbeth's family lived on an estate in the Blue Ridge Mountains near Asheville, North Carolina; afterwards, her mother had a "modern house" built in an "exclusive district" of a small town in Maryland (*Boulevard Career* 16-17). Both Livesay and Macbeth had private educations. Macbeth writes that she "had a lady-governess for years," and attended an "exclusive private school" (32, 36). In her autobiography, *Journey with My Selves*, Livesay describes her Toronto high school, Glen Mawr, as a "polite ladies' finishing school," where the curriculum "emphasized the arts - music, painting, drama and the history of art" (*Journey* 68, 60). Macbeth attended a finishing school in London, Ontario, Hellmuth College, where Elizabeth (Bessie) Lyons sent her adolescent daughter in order to end her affair with an alcoholic actor thirty years her senior. Their educations prepared Livesay and Macbeth for the Victorian feminine role of their generations, a role that was recommended to married women of the middle and upper classes.

Macbeth and Livesay both excelled in languages; Macbeth was fluent in Spanish and French, while Livesay spoke Italian and French. However, the uses to which they each envisioned putting these talents differs at the level of class. Macbeth writes, "I saw myself conversing with This or That Diplomatic group, sliding from Polish to Spanish, from Greek to Norwegian, scarcely pausing for punctuation" (*Boulevard Career* 137). Macbeth's youthful dream presents the upper-class image of a diplomat's wife whose role as hostess is invaluable to her husband's work. Among other factors, knowledge of a second or third language would qualify a woman as an appropriate candidate for marriage to a diplomat, politician, or other professional; the ability to make guests feel comfortable at social or professional gatherings, through speaking their native language, was a useful skill for such women. Although Macbeth did not marry a diplomat, she socialized with them in Ottawa, especially after her husband's death. In his foreword to her first memoir, *Over My Shoulder*, B.K. Sandwell points out that the widowed Macbeth was in demand at diplomatic functions, "because diplomatic and political 'shines' often produce a surplus of males and they have to be matched off with females" (vii). He claims that Macbeth could "talk to anybody in almost any language (they say she can insult a Tass representative in Jugoslav as well as Marshal Tito himself)" (vii). On the other hand, Livesay's middle-class plans concerning languages centred on being a teacher of modern languages. She studied French and Italian at the University of Toronto as well as in Europe, and wrote an honours thesis on French literature at the Sorbonne. The lack of teaching positions in the Depression years, just after Livesay's graduation, induced her to change her career plan from teaching to social work, a female-dominated field that was becoming professionalized by the entry of unemployed middle- class men during the Depression. When she turned to teaching again in the 1950s, Livesay taught creative writing to university students in Canada and to student-teachers in Africa.

The purpose for which Livesay studied foreign languages marks the differences in her and Macbeth's class positions at birth, and the differences in their performances of gender. As a white, middle-class woman, Livesay expected to work outside the home in a profession; as a white, upper-class woman, Macbeth expected to augment her husband's profession. Although their visions of the role of languages differed, both Livesay's and Macbeth's fluency in other languages was consistent with the feminine gender role of their historical moment; that is, their interest in languages was influenced and nurtured by both class and gender, for the white, middle- or upper-class Canadian woman was expected to excel, or at least specialize, in the humanities. This expectation was a leftover from nineteenth-century Victorian images of femininity, and was not universally accepted by Canadian women; however, in 1920, 81.62 percent of Canadian female university students studied the humanities while only 48.84 percent of male students chose these fields (Strong-Boag 23). Neither Livesay nor Macbeth were radical in their use of non-English languages, despite differences in their class positions and gender performances.

Gendered expectations were also prevalent in the area of economic investments. For instance, women of Macbeth's class were expected to be ignorant of financial matters. Consequently, Elizabeth Lyons entrusted the family fortune to a male broker who made poor investment choices and lost the funds. Their financial difficulties forced Macbeth to change her class-related behaviour; she learned to cook, tend the furnace, shovel snow, and earn an income from writing. "I discarded my hereditary ideas about work," she writes, "when a lady would have lost caste if she made her own bed!" (*Boulevard Career* 103). The material reality of Macbeth's financial difficulties required her to write popular literature for a mass market, rather than literary writing for a restricted few, even though the class position of her birth family suggests a more leisurely and individualistic participation in the literary field, one unbounded by the need to make money or to conform to generic requirements. Macbeth moved from the upper class to the upper middle class, whereas Livesay was a member of the middle class throughout her life. Livesay's poetry writing was supported by her various income-producing activities as social worker, journalist, community organizer, and teacher. Both women had to earn a living and the issue of professionalism was important. For instance, at various times in their careers, both Livesay and Macbeth wrote for *The Star Weekly*, a Saturday supplement of the *Toronto Daily Star*. *The Star Weekly* paid well, $100 for a feature article in the late forties, and the ability to capture a good salary for an article signified professional status.[12] Writing was the centre of both of these women's lives, but their writing occupied positions in different areas of the literary field.

Both Livesay and Macbeth chose to combine writing with motherhood, but Livesay always struggled with the time-conflict between these two vocations, whereas Macbeth seems to have been more comfortable with her triple roles of dual parent and professional writer. During her early publishing years, Macbeth translated into English a volume by Spanish humour writer Santiago de Rusinol, and, during nine months spent living in New York in 1918, she worked in a publishing house. Macbeth had the advantage of a live-in mother who took on the parenting role during her absences from Ottawa. Livesay lived in Vancouver and her parents resided in Toronto, too far to assist her on a daily basis. In the forties, Livesay found the triple workload difficult but preferable to isolation in the home. In 1943, she wrote to her father, "I find I get in a desperate state in the house alone and if I can possibly carry on working I am a better mother for the children" (UM Mss37 Box 37 Folder 5 March 26, 1943). Motherhood made Livesay aware of the systemic denigration of reproductive labour, a denigration which leads to the trivialization of the needs of women writers who have children. She was much more assertive than either her contemporaries or women of Macbeth's generation on the issue of funding for female writers with children. In response to Livesay's requests in both 1944 and 1945, Pierce arranged for cash advances on royalties for a proposed memoir on Raymond Knister (UA 96-69 Queen's box 5 File 81 May 19, 1944; July 30, 1945; August 31, 1945). In 1952, Livesay asked Pierce for a monthly allowance to pay for household help while she wrote a novel; Pierce replied that a published novel would not earn enough of a return to justify a subsidy (UA 96-69 Queen's Box 2 File 20 September 25, 1952). In addition, Livesay submitted a brief on this topic to the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences (the Massey Commission). "If married," she wrote, "a woman writer cannot work at all unless she has a housekeeper. But no deductions in her income tax are available for this heavy overhead expense" (UM Mss37 Box 106 Folder 14 p.2). The issue also surfaced in her creative writing. In 1953, Livesay wrote "The Three Emilys," a poem in which she compares her roles as writer and mother to that of three single women writers, Emily Bronte, Emily Dickinson, and Emily Carr. Although Livesay concludes the poem with "And so the whole that I possess / Is still much less -," she later qualified her conclusion as "one phase of my feelings," a phase in which she "envied" single women writers (*The Self-Completing Tree* 83; Barber 19). Since the time required for the sustained concentration that a novel demands was not available to her, Livesay turned to journalism for income. Financial needs also took Macbeth into the field of journalism while her children were young. Thus, widowhood had an impact on Macbeth's class position, while financial necessity influenced the literary choices made by both women.

The difficulties encountered by women writers who were also mothers relates to a basic premise of this dissertation: the literary field is masculinist. I define masculinism, characterized by power imbalances, hierarchy, duality, and gender stereotypes, as the systemic institutionalization of patriarchal ideology.[13] Feminism has a major role in the choices I make in this dissertation, and my writing is based on my feminist standpoint. Maggie Humm writes, "Feminist theory begins with women's experience of oppression and argues that women's subordination extends from private circumstances to political conditions" (224). Sandra Harding uses standpoint theory to situate women in relation to masculinist systems, and Dorothy Smith uses standpoint theory as a point from which to initiate feminist research.[14] Standpoint theory is contested as essentialist by some feminist theorists, such as Rosemary Hennessy, but the risk of essentialism can be averted by self-reflexivity and attention to differences.[15] As the editors of *A Glossary of Feminist Theory* point out, standpoint theory is "a consciously chosen political and social location, a range of possible vantage points available to men as well as women" (259).

I have found Catherine Hundleby's feminist philosophy to be useful in my attempt to start from a feminist position in this project because Hundleby locates feminist standpoint theories in material conditions. She defines oppositional consciousness as the desire for social change and she argues that oppositional consciousness is integral to standpoint theories.[16] On more than one level, this dissertation illustrates Hundleby's thesis. As a female technician (in my first career) in the male-dominated film and television industry, I experienced sexual harassment and systemic discrimination in the field of cultural production, and became involved in union activities in an effort to produce change.[17] Livesay and Macbeth faced discrimination on the basis of sex in the literary field of their period, expressed different degrees of oppositional consciousness, and worked to institute change. The process of the development of oppositional and non-oppositional stances in their lifeworks is a process which I hope to elucidate in this dissertation. As I attempt to do that, I try to recognize my own constructedness by hegemonic discourses, and I emulate Hennessy's call for a critique of masculinist ideology through the analysis of each subject-position's "articulated system of positions in the historical process and the subject produced out of that system" (96).

I do not claim that my experiences or those of Livesay and/or Macbeth represent the experiences of a monolithic or undifferentiated group of Canadian women, and I am sceptical of current theoretical tendencies to downplay similarities and focus on differences. My scepticism on this point rests on my commitment to social change. I agree with Anne Ferguson and Stuart Hall who, as I explain in Chapter 2, seek grounds for unified political action while acknowledging differences. With regard to gender, oppression of some kind is faced by everyone in the category "woman." Those women who turn to feminism choose a standpoint that opposes the doxa related to masculinist systems of power and representation. Such opposition is intersected by and articulates with issues surrounding race, ethnicity, class, and sexual orientation. I see gender and race as more powerful identifiers than class, ethnicity, and sexual orientation, and I develop my disagreement with Marxist feminists on the hierarchy of these identifiers in Chapter 2. Furthermore, opposition to oppression does not dominate the lifework of every woman who is a feminist, and most people remain interpellated by hegemonic values in some respects. These articulations highlight points of differences among feminists.

Both Livesay and Macbeth had feminist ancestors. Livesay describes her mother, Florence, as "a feminist, but sadly restricted," perhaps by the antifeminism of her day, perhaps by her conservative attitude to sexuality, perhaps by her adherence to the Anglican church (*Journey* 187). Macbeth's maternal grandmother Maffit was a suffragist in the 1870s in Maryland. According to Macbeth, Mrs. Maffit "was anti-slavery, anti-Secession, pro-Union and pro-Women's Rights. She was a friend and supporter of Susan B. Anthony," the American suffrage leader (*Boulevard Career* 11). In *Century of Struggle*, Eleanor Flexner argues that Anthony's feminism was marked by her positions on class and race. Anthony and her close collaborator, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, objected to the fourteenth amendment to the American constitution of 1866, which instituted universal male suffrage, not only because the amendment ignored the question of female enfranchisement, but also because most of the men affected by this legislation were either recently-freed African Americans who, supposedly, threatened white female purity, or immigrant men who could speak little English (Flexner 147). In the last ten years of her life, Stanton "became increasingly interested in the divorce question and in an educated (as opposed to universal) franchise" (226). Although Macbeth does not recognize or chooses not to address the limits of her grandmother's suffragism, it is likely that Mrs. Maffit's feminism was also marked by class, ethnic, and race-based articulations similar to those expressed by other upper-class American women, such as Anthony and Stanton.

Livesay and Macbeth also had feminist mentors. Florence was Dorothy's literary mentor, typing her daughter's early work, submitting it to journals and newspapers, reporting on her childhood behaviour in her own newspaper column, introducing Dorothy to publishers, writers, and literary journals, such as *Poetry* (Chicago), and editing Livesay's second volume of poetry, *Signpost* (1932). After Livesay moved to British Columbia in 1936, married and started her own family, Florence continued to act as liaison between Livesay and her publishers, such as Ryerson Press.[18] Later in life, the daughter continued the mother's mentoring tradition with unrelated women writers, through the production of anthologies of women writers and through personal relationships. In her Afterword to *Archive for Our Times*, Di Brandt describes the mentoring she experienced from Livesay:

> I called her my literary grandmother, cross-generational muse of ecstatic self-expression and keen-eyed observation. And she thought of me also as a kind of daughter or granddaughter, kindred rebel against staid convention, a partner in *caring*. (Irvine 248)

Macbeth was encouraged and assisted in her early literary career by Marjorie MacMurchy, author and president of the Canadian Women's Press Club (CWPC 1909-1913), who, as literary editor of the Toronto *News*, gave Macbeth the opportunity to work as an interviewer. The *Feminist Companion to Literature in English* describes MacMurchy as "widely known for her support for and generosity to other women writers" (697).

At the turn of the century, Macbeth, MacMurchy, and their contemporaries lived in a social milieu in which feminism was perceived to be a radical movement and a threat to society. Feminist theorists and historians have distinguished among maternal, radical, socialist, Black and liberal feminisms, among others.[19] Maternal feminists see motherhood as central to the lives of all women. In "New Woman, New World: Maternal Feminism and the New Imperialism in the White Settler Colonies," Cecily Devereux elucidates the contradictory nature of first-wave feminism in Canada by pointing out that maternal feminism was developed as a strategy for deflecting antifeminists' attention from the figure of the independent New Woman[20] by incorporating the Victorian figure of the angel-in-the-house with the New Woman's focus on the public fields of politics and economics (8). The figure of the New Woman, which first appears in the 1890s in conjunction with modernism, represents a rejection of Victorian mores which restrict women to marriage, the home, and the role of moral guardian. In the first two decades of the twentieth century, Canadian maternal feminist suffragists, among them Nellie McClung and Emily Murphy, hoped that women's votes would sanitize politics of corruption and hasten social reform. Their hopes were based on the assumption that women were the moral guardians of society, an assumption also encountered in the values underlying the Victorian figure of the angel in the house. Although Macbeth belongs to the generation of Canadian suffragists and her grandmother was an American suffragist, she did not participate in the struggle for female enfranchisement. Many Canadian women who believed in white female suffrage and white male/female equality in the fields of work and education rejected the term feminist for fear of being connected to the widespread stereotype of the unfeminine suffragette and the New Woman (Dean 65). Although Lady Aberdeen, Macbeth's first employer, believed in the vote for women and worked within Canadian feminist organizations such as the National Council of Women in Canada (NCWC), she felt that a public alliance with the suffrage movement would damage her ability to work with conservative and radical Canadian women (Prentice 201). Macbeth may have followed Aberdeen's lead on this point.

However, as a young woman, Macbeth emulated the figure of the New Woman. At the time of her college graduation, around the turn of the twentieth century, Macbeth wanted to remain single, "to be queer, to be a lady, yet earn my own living" (*Boulevard Career* 69). Being queer was not a sexual identity in that time period; Macbeth's word choice refers both to her mother's description of artists and actors, and to Macbeth's own description of the New Woman. Macbeth writes that she "saw the status of women changing - especially in regard to financial matters" and believed that she "played a modest part in that change" (*Boulevard Career* 103). In her fiction, Macbeth often deals with the inequality of male-female relationships, but she also often satirizes suffragists and unfaithful wives, and more often than not, her heroines return to their dominant husbands after a dispute over an instance of inequality. Macbeth was not alone in these traditional narrative endings. In *The New Day Recalled*, Strong-Boag suggests that the frequency of such endings derived largely from the concurrent prevalence of male editors who sought traditional narrative endings and who had power over female writers' income (95). Macbeth's contradictory relationship with first-wave feminism parallels that of Sara Jeannette Duncan's, and these contradictions appear in their writing.[21] In the adventure-romance *The Patterson Limit* (1923), Macbeth creates Ray Lane, a heroine who represents the conjunction of the New Woman and the maternal feminist. Lane leaves Crewsbury, her village in New England, because she rejects the narrow definitions of gender roles that are practised there, travels to a remote village in Quebec, and becomes the best fire- ranger ever. Travelling alone, working in a masculine occupation against great opposition, and overcoming physical hardship are factors of the narrative that contribute to *The Patterson Limit*'s representation of Ray Lane as a New Woman. However, the New Woman figure is modified by the author's maternal feminist message; for instance, Lane's forestry work is compared to housework and she becomes a steward of nature (145). Devereux's contention that in Canada maternal feminism was a reaction to the radicalism of the New Woman seems to be borne out here and in Macbeth's later novel, *Shackles* (1926). In both novels, the heroine finally turns to the traditional domestic arena for fulfilment. I analyze *Shackles* in detail in Chapter 4.

In some ways, Macbeth belongs more to the nineteenth century than to the twentieth. In the intersection of the New Woman with the maternal feminist, the remnants of nineteenth-century Victorianism appear in Macbeth's life and work. The New Woman smoked, travelled alone, and functioned mainly in the public sphere. Macbeth's personal enactment of the New Woman figure was sporadic; for instance, although she smoked and travelled alone to Yugoslavia in 1935, she often travelled with her sister Natalie, her brother Douglas, or female colleagues and friends, especially during the 1920s. Furthermore, lack of clarity concerning her birth date was a lifelong position for Macbeth. Was this confusion an instance of coy femininity or a pragmatic strategy for dealing with ageism? The New Woman may not have been concerned about her age, but the Victorian woman was.

Livesay's feminist practice was more straightforward. She was vocal on issues of equality and independence for women throughout her life, and she often faced discrimination on the basis of sex. Upon her marriage in 1937, she expected immediate dismissal from her social work position because a discriminatory labour law held that married women could not work in full time professional jobs. A sympathetic female supervisor allowed Livesay to continue working until her husband found employment as an accountant. In the early thirties, Livesay discovered that her male colleagues in the Communist Party of Canada (CPC) viewed their wives as their property, and this double standard created divisions between single politically active leftist women and those leftist women who were relegated to the home through marriage and childcare duties. "Such were the dichotomies I found in male-female relationships in the thirties," she writes in *Right Hand Left Hand* (124). "In theory, we were free and equal as comrades on the left. In practice, our right hand was tied to the kitchen sink!" (124). The choices made by Livesay in the late seventies during the compilation of *Right Hand Left Hand* (1977) are evidence of her feminist sympathies. In this memoir of the thirties, Livesay reprints "Women Are Mugs," an article by Marjorie King which was first published in *New Frontier* of 1936. "Women Are Mugs" is an analysis of the ideological construction of white Canadian middle-class women as housewives, as well as a call to liberation from traditional gender roles. Even Livesay's love poetry is a declaration of independence; in "The Unquiet Bed" (1967), Livesay writes:

> the woman I am
> is not what you see
> move over love
> make room for me
>
> (*The Self-Completing Tree* 117).

In her senior years, she continued to engage privately with male contemporaries over sexist behaviour or language. In a letter to Leo Kennedy, dated March 13, 1977, she writes, "As for your "jingles" - - you should ask Layton's opinion, not mine! Dost not realize that any male writing that looks upon woman as sex object would be beneath my scorn? (Do women write jingles about penises?)" (UM Mss 37 Box 59 Fd 16).

Livesay does not belong to the generation of maternal feminists who achieved female suffrage, but she admired them. In a review of the first volume of McClung's autobiography, *Clearing in the West* (1935), Livesay praises first-wave feminists for "challeng[ing] the men to give them a vote for their labor, and homestead rights" (UM Mss 37 Box 99 Folder 27). In this undated review, which may have been written around 1935, Livesay positions herself within the genealogy of Marxist Canadian feminist writers by criticizing McClung's misapprehension of "the economic and social forces at work" in the historical moment covered by *Clearing in the West* (Folder 27). Livesay qualifies her criticism with these words: "Yet because she was a fighter when young, and a suffragette, she is to be honored. Who knows, she may now be an anti-fascist?" (Folder 27).

However, Livesay's relationship with feminism is tenuous from certain perspectives, and indicative of the transitory nature of the feminisms practised by Canadian women of the generation situated between the first and second waves of Canadian feminisms. In her autobiography, Livesay described her 1932 self as "still in the romantic throes of the clinging-vine myth" (*Journey* 80). She was doing graduate work in Paris, and her partner, Tony, wanted her to be more independent, but, as Livesay writes, "at the time I could not accept an independent feminist role" (80). She wanted a family.[22] In the forties, when Livesay was ready for independence, her husband, Duncan, was not prepared for the adjustment, and their disputes escalated into domestic violence; Livesay took the children and sought refuge with friends Alan and Jean Crawley, who edited *Contemporary Verse*, the Canadian poetry magazine which Livesay co-founded with Doris Ferne, Anne Marriott, and Floris McLaren in 1941.

During the second wave of feminism in the 1970s and 1980s, Livesay's attitude to the role of women in society is clarified and expanded upon in interviews which suggest that Livesay was a maternal feminist. In a 1981 interview with *The Vancouver Sun*, reporter Lloyd Dykk writes, "She has always maintained that her 'feminism,' which is unstridulant [sic] and for the most free of cant, developed from her central concern of wishing to see the world restored to a state of balance and safety for future generations" (L41). Here is the principle of maternal feminism, that motherhood is central to the role of every woman, projected onto the international scene. Maternal feminists believed that women should transfer their motherhood roles from the private sphere to the public.[23] Livesay's adherence to maternal feminism was more clearly revealed in 1979, when she told Marsha Barber:

> I also differ from the feminists in that I feel it is very important for a mother to spend time with her children. I find it upsetting the way so many women go off and selfishly leave their children to their own devices, which usually means that they are passively glued to TV for hours on end - and to junk food meals! (32)

In this quotation, Livesay assumes that most women are mothers, at the same time as she supports a traditional middle-class style of motherhood. Maternal feminists of earlier generations also saw motherhood and food preparation as essential to women's family roles. As Veronica Strong-Boag points out, "much of the feminists' case for suffrage had rested on the pledge that women's work at home would in no way be neglected" (113). In 1928, Macbeth blamed the rising divorce rate partially on the modern wife's ignorance about nutrition and home cooking ("Until Love Dies" 4). On this point, Livesay's feminist position differs little from Macbeth's, a fact that illustrates the power of ideological interpellation and the articulation of hegemonic discourses with contestatory discourses, such as feminism.

My development as a Canadian feminist within the socioeconomic parameters of the second half of the twentieth century began with family life. Like many elder daughters of large working-poor families, I was delegated and took on more responsibility than most children my age; there were six children at home, three of whom I cared for from infancy, a task that began when I was eight years old. I remember two aspects to this early responsibility: I had no time for personal interests or the play that children of my age normally indulged in, yet I learned how to give direction, to delegate, and to lead. The ability to lead others became part of my personality or habitus, which Bourdieu defines as "a system of enduring dispositions" (Bourdieu in Calhoun 74). My directive disposition was appropriate within the family, where it was perceived as caretaking; however, it was inappropriate in Canadian society of the 1950s, where it was perceived as unfeminine. My feminism was born both from the contradiction between these two areas of life, the private and public spheres, and from my experiences of male-female inequities within the family itself. I reacted by embracing feminism, a very different world view from that of my family. My situation illustrates Bridget Fowler's description of Bourdieu's "radicalised idea of anomie, that is, a discrepancy between expectations and experience with its potentially politicising effects" (3). Moreover, a strong role model in the person of my mother, who has never been a feminist but who has been hard working, independent, and politically active, led me to consider the possibilities for a woman who rejects the restrictions that my mother accepts.

According to Bourdieu's model of the habitus, other life choices are made partly on the basis of early experiences inside and outside the family. In adulthood, my feminist oppositional consciousness both motivated my participation in the anti-pornography and pro-disarmament movements of the 1980s, and was further entrenched by my experiences in the processes of these political activities. In the disarmament movement, I experienced the devaluation of my contribution, a devaluation that many women who engage in political action face. Some male leaders of the disarmament group resented my technical abilities and access to broadcasting technology. As a supporter of the anti-pornography movement, I spent two years on the Ontario Film Review Board (OFRB) in 1986. In this community service role, I viewed pornographic videos, among others, and classified them for public consumption. The experience of watching misogynist cultural products had material effects on my standpoints both in the OFRB, where I was marginalized as a feminist, and in other areas of my life and work. I found that, although each Board member was expected to represent a particular community, the feminist community which I chose to represent was devalued as a special interest group by many members of the OFRB. In relation to this dissertation, these experiences have led me to survey the field of Canadian literary production with a specific viewpoint which, besides being feminist and oppositional, is white, working-class, Canadian, nationalist, and heterosexual.

This articulated system of positions motivates me to question whether systemic discrimination and power differentials affected the lives of Canadian women writers in the 1920-1950 period. The compilation of material evidence, that is, tangible evidence such as writers' income, publication histories, and public recognition(s) in comparison to others in the same field and time period, is central to my research methodology.

The trajectories of the literary careers of Livesay and Macbeth are closely tied to the material conditions within which they operated. Each of them represents various locations on the political and literary continua at various points in time; Livesay's and Macbeth's white, heterosexual, upper- and middle-class constructions are intersected by differences in their oppositional consciousnesses in relation to literary standards, nationalism, internationalism, and politics. In the political field, Macbeth's interests place her both in opposition to governmental policy and in agreement with it, at different periods and over different issues. In the twenties, as a leader in the CAA, she actively opposed the Canadian government's position on literary copyright, an issue I examine in Chapter 3. On the other hand, during both world wars, Macbeth's activism supported the political hegemony of the British Empire by means that were appropriate to her class position. In *Boulevard Career*, she reveals that in 1918, she "once a week made pneumonia jackets for U.S. soldiers at Mrs. Rockefeller's" in New York city (135). During WWII, Macbeth was a fundraiser for the Ottawa Local Council of Women, an organization which had the support of the British royalty through the presence of H.R.H. Princess Alice, Countess of Athlone. During this fund-raising drive, Macbeth undertook a national speaking tour in which she urged Canadian women to contribute money to replace weapons lost by the Allies. This type of volunteer work was much less traditionally feminine than knitting socks, and Macbeth urged Canadian women to reduce their commitment to the more traditional activities.[24]

Macbeth's class position predisposed her to support imperialism and monarchism. She characterized Canada as a helpmate to the leader in the allied war effort, Britain, in her many WWII interviews and speeches. In a speech titled "Patriotism and You," which Macbeth delivered to the Westmount Women's Club in 1941, she said, "it is for the women of Canada, to point out a way to the future; a British way of things to come; nothing less will serve" (NAC MG 30 D52 Vol.14 Scrapbook 1940-1944).[25] Macbeth's connections to royalty and other holders of cultural capital are legion; she was a monarchist. In 1935, she was given "a cultural decoration," the Order of Saint Sava, by the King of Yugoslavia. Between 1943 and 1945, Macbeth wrote articles on diplomats, their sisters and wives, Canadian female philanthropists, skating champion Barbara Ann Scott, and Princess Juliana of the Netherlands for *Mayfair* magazine, an upscale, glossy, Canadian magazine similar to *Vanity Fair*. Macbeth closes the article about Princess Juliana, titled "Au Revoir Juliana!," with these words:

> I like to think that Princess Juliana's memories of Canada, birthplace of her youngest baby, will be fond and lasting. Especially, I like to picture her serving a wide and contented Empire according to the pattern laid down by little Beatrix for a good Queen. (62)

"[T]he pattern laid down by little Beatrix" refers to the six-year-old girl's understanding of her family's position at the top of the class structure of the Netherlands, an understanding which rationalizes her grandmother Wilhelmina's role as Queen of the Netherlands through focusing on the alleged benefits to those subjects whom the Queen patronizes. Macbeth presents this view in Beatrix's own words:

> She is Queen because she is so good, so awfully kind to her people. This makes them love her terribly much, and when you love any one as much as that, of course you want to make them Queen. Besides, a good Queen is the very best kind for the people, so they've done a good thing for themselves, as well. (54)

In her commentary on these words, Macbeth writes, "the Royal Family in Holland is the symbol of family life...the Netherlands [sic] sovereigns do not wish to *rule* but to *serve*" (emphasis in original 54). Macbeth's references in this article to both the Dutch Empire and its royalty indicate not only her sympathetic position within the discourse of imperialism, but also one way in which the metaphor of the family, which often appears in nationalist discourses, can be used to naturalize imperialism.

Macbeth's relationship to British imperialism was concurrent with that of many

Canadian nationalists of both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries: Canadian nationalism and loyalty to the British Empire were synonymous for the majority of English Canadians, but members of the upper classes were further motivated to support imperialism by the prospect of increased profits. Imperial federationists in Canada saw the development of the country as dependent upon the strength of the British Empire. Class, cultural capital, and political power characterize the members of the Round Table group, a force behind the Canadian movement for imperial federation between 1908 and 1938 (Quigley passim). Canadians such as J.S. Willison, Arthur Glazebrook, George Parkin, Governor-General Lord Grey and the following generation in the fields of politics, business, academia, and the arts, including Parkin's son-in-law Vincent Massey, belonged to the Canadian branches of the Round Table Group, which was exclusively male and financed by the British imperialist Cecil Rhodes (Quigley passim). J.S. Willison later became Sir Willison and married Marjorie MacMurchy, one of Macbeth's literary mentors. Imperialism was also a naturalized element in the discursive practice of early Canadian women writers, such as Sara Jeannette Duncan, Nellie McClung, Marjorie Pickthall, Agnes Maule Machar, and L.M. Montgomery.[26]

In contrast, Livesay was anti-war and anti-imperialism. Too young to be interested in such issues during WWI, she belongs to the generation for whom the Spanish Civil War was a touchstone. The widely differing positions taken by Livesay and Macbeth in relation to Spain's transition from a monarchy to a republic exemplify the political opposition of these two Canadian women writers at one moment in time. When King Alfonso left Spain in April 1931, a republic was formed and a provisional government established. At this time, Macbeth was staying alone at a hotel on the outskirts of Cadiz, Spain, during a tour for a proposed travel book. She was unaware of the seriousness of the political crisis between Spanish monarchists and Spanish republicans. While her fellow guests vacated the hotel "in a panic," she went downtown, where she discovered that signs related to the monarchy had been destroyed overnight (*Boulevard Career* 164). She spoke to a police officer, who declared, "We burned the King in effigy. It was a splendid performance," but Macbeth mourned the passing of the Spanish royalty (162). That same day, April 15, 1931, a mob appeared at the high, wrought-iron fence at the front of the hotel property, a fence which, to my mind, represents the class barriers functioning under the Spanish monarchy. Macbeth believed that a looting attack was narrowly averted by the hotel manager, who faced the crowd and pledged allegiance to the new republican government. In Macbeth's account of this period of Spanish history, her sympathy for the monarchy is clear; she declares that "for me Spain would never be the same again," and "the Spanish people were not temperamentally ready for a republic" (163, 166). She is more concerned about the Spanish aristocracy's loss of both power and cultural artifacts than about the development of democracy, and says so in an earlier travel book, *Over the Gangplank to Spain* (1931): "The changes effected by the Republican Government are less interesting to me than those structures and customs that have prevailed for centuries" (50). Macbeth's imperialism and monarchism have both a class and a material basis; her habitus was formed in the American upper class and her middle-class family's income was dependent upon her upper-class connections. Furthermore, Macbeth's paternal grandmother was of Spanish descent and the granddaughter's concern for the survival of Spanish customs and cultural artifacts indicates an interest in her ancestry. Sociologist Wsevolod Isajiw has coined a term for people like Macbeth, "ethnic rediscoverers," which he defines as:

> persons from any consecutive ethnic generation who have been socialized into the culture of the general society but who develop a symbolic relation to the culture of their ancestors. Even relatively few items from the cultural past, such as folk art, music, can become symbols of ethnic identity. (16) [27]

When the Spanish Civil War broke out in 1936, Macbeth wisely decided to avoid Europe and travelled instead to South America for material for her travel articles. The Spanish invaders of South and Central America left an enduring mark on those societies, a cultural mark which may have attracted Macbeth. During the Spanish civil war, Livesay, on the other hand, was not only writing poetry on behalf of the Canadian and Spanish under classes, she was also a member of the Canadian League Against War and Fascism (CLAWF) and, as a member of the Committee in Aid of Spanish Democracy, she was actively involved in fund raising on behalf of the Spanish republicans. If she had been in

Cadiz on April 15, 1931, Livesay, in spite of her membership in the middle class, would have been on the opposite side of the wrought-iron fence which protected Macbeth from the mob she feared.

If Macbeth has one foot in the nineteenth century, Livesay is entirely of the twentieth century; for example, the openness with which Livesay approaches the genre of life writing is vastly different from Macbeth's approach. In my view, Livesay's life narrative is both more forthcoming and more personal than is Macbeth's, and it presents a more autonomous subject-position than the one we meet in Macbeth's life narrative. Livesay had periods of depression throughout her life. Competition with her best female friend over relationships with men, callous treatment by male lovers, a crisis over the clash between poetry and proletarian writing, and guilt over her imaginary role in Raymond Knister's death led to her first breakdown in 1934.[28] She followed medical advice to quit her job as a social worker in New Jersey, returned to Ontario, and wrote her first low modernist poetry during this period of recovery.[29] Furthermore, Livesay was the daughter of an alcoholic wife-abuser, and she married a man who abused her. She was herself an alcoholic between 1965 and 1980.[30] In "Open Letter to Marsha Barber," Livesay blames her addiction on the attempt to relieve pain from sciatica and gout without turning to drugs (35). In an interview, Livesay attributes the start of her alcoholism to the years spent teaching in Africa between 1959 and 1962, after Duncan's death. "One can be very isolated and lonely at night," she says of Zambia (Barber 25). On the other hand, she also says, "It was the music and the dancing in Africa that released me" (Robertson 5).

The release that Livesay felt in her life and in her poetry during the early 1960s still functions in the autobiography she wrote thirty years later. *Journey With My Selves* (1991) is a frank description of her birth family, her own family, her education, her literary motivations and influences, her work, her politics, and her sexuality. Although she identified as a heterosexual through most of her life, she had lesbian affairs in her youth and senior years. In 1930, during a visit to her father's home on the Isle of Wight, Livesay had a lesbian encounter with a female cousin, yet the next day she decided "that we should forget about the night we had spent together: it was not a good thing" (123). In high school, her best friend Gina (Jean Watts Lawson) was in love with Livesay and suffered a nervous breakdown because the feelings were not reciprocal. At the age of sixty-nine, Livesay wrote to Leo Kennedy that she had "commit[ed]" herself to "a young woman who ha[d] been in love with [her] for three years," citing the "well known" problems of older women who are routinely overlooked by their male contemporaries for younger partners (UM Mss37 Box59 Folder 16 n.d.). Livesay adds, "it was a rare meeting of bodies and psyches" (Folder 16 n.d.). Livesay's frankness concerning her sexuality raises the question of compulsory heterosexuality, defined by Adrienne Rich as "the main mechanism underlying and perpetuating male dominance" (Humm 34). The naturalization of heterosexuality through the symbolic violence of gender may provide a partial explanation for the frequency with which Livesay's autobiography reports cases of her female friends who experienced early lesbian love and subsequently chose to identify heterosexually.

Livesay published *Journey with My Selves* in 1991 at the age of eighty-two; Macbeth published *Boulevard Career* in 1957 at the age of seventy-nine. Macbeth's life writing is remarkably reticent and non-introspective in comparison to Livesay's. Charles Macbeth is almost absent from this volume, perhaps because Macbeth had adopted the independent attitude of a New Woman, perhaps because they were estranged in life as in death, perhaps because Macbeth still felt, at the time of writing *Boulevard Career*, pain over the early loss of her husband. She travelled around the world, often alone during the thirties, yet we hear nothing of the amorous encounters she may have had during the time she spent away from the restrictions of family life. For instance, Macbeth relates that she drank homebrew and danced on the Equator at a native Ecuadoran celebration outside Quito in 1936, a celebration to which an unnamed male friend drove her (*Boulevard* 197-199). The question inevitably arises: How did Macbeth meet all the people who appear in her memoir? On several occasions, she mentions making acquaintances in parks or public squares, but few details follow these suggestive comments. Nor does Macbeth dwell on her achievements. *Boulevard Career* often reads like a travel book; indeed, several passages are identical to those in her earlier travel book, *Over the Gangplank to Spain* (1931).

Macbeth's memoir is an example of the way in which life writing is culturally mediated. I believe that Macbeth is reticent about her inner thoughts, her accomplishments, and her intimate relationships, that she adopts a humorous, light, and deprecating stance with regard to herself because she is conforming to Victorian gender expectations of the feminine woman, that is, the woman who is "good" but not "exceptional" (Buss 19). As Helen Buss explains in *Mapping Ourselves*:

> cultural definitions of a "good" woman as one always sacrificing the self for the other has meant that while it is possible for a woman to write a memoir (a recounting of one's place as a member of a group) without too much censure, autobiography (the account of one's self-development) is a risky activity for women. (24)

Macbeth considered it risky. On May 23, 1940, she wrote the following in her diary: "I can imagine some escape for myself in such work, but shy away from the hurt when publishers begin to refuse it. An intimate revelation, which would be the most absorbing to write, would appeal to so few people, I fear" (NAC MG30 D52 Vol.17 p.79).

Personality differences between Macbeth and Livesay also figure in the different strategies they adopted in relation to autobiographical revelations. Although Macbeth was a public figure, she was far less willing to dismantle the divisions between her private and public lives than was Livesay. Macbeth considered writing an autobiography as early as 1940. In her diary of that year, she reports on reading Somerset Maugham's literary autobiography, published in 1938:

> Reading Maugham's *Summing Up* spurs me to write as near that sort of thing as I can because it's easy. Not easy to do so with his skill, but to think out loud (on paper) about [illegible] and my reasons for doing thus. So, the trouble in my case is that no one will be as interested in reading me as in S. Maugham. (NAC MG30 D52 Vol.17 Page 76)

On May 26, 1940, she records that the manuscript for *Shreds of Circumstance* (1947) was returned by the Knopf publishing company without a reader's report and that her friend and colleague, Eric Gaskell, Secretary of the CAA, suggested that she write her autobiography and use "Macmillan's reader's phrase, Boulevard Career" as the title (NAC

MG30 D52 Vol.17 p.78). Macbeth took Gaskell's suggestion for her second memoir, but she published another memoir, *Over My Shoulder*, four years before *Boulevard Career* appeared.

Macbeth's reticence about her private life induced her to use her private experiences as material for her novels and to write about her public life in her memoirs. For instance, many of the incidents in *Lost: A Cavalier* (1947) closely resemble events in the latter portion of Macbeth's diary, which covers the period from January 1938 to May 1945. Livesay, on the other hand, produced a memoir in *Right Hand Left Hand* (1977), an autobiography in *Journey with My Selves* (1991), and two volumes of autobiographical fiction in *A Winnipeg Childhood* (1973) and *Beginnings* (1988). However, on the title page of *Journey with My Selves* and in its Preface, Livesay calls the book "a memoir" (9). Macbeth, on the other hand, reflects on the differences between the genres of memoir and autobiography in her introduction to *Boulevard Career*:

> The writing of an autobiography is a tricky undertaking. If there is too much of the personal pronoun, the reader is apt to ask, 'Who cares?' If there is too little, the book is not an autobiography but an inadequate record of events; neither fish nor fowl nor good red herring.
>
> So realizing the pitfalls that lurk in my path, I dare not call this an autobiography. It is not a history, or a travelogue. It is just a book in which I hope to accomplish mentally what the camel accomplishes physically; recalling some of my adventurings; remembering some of my impressions of a world that is gone forever. (ix)

Macbeth's work lies mainly in the field of popular literature, but the thoughtfulness and self-reflexivity that she reveals in this introduction belies any assumptions we may have concerning the alleged lack of concern for questions of literary form on the part of writers who choose commercial or popular genres. As I argue in Chapter 2, the dichotomies of the popular-literature/literary-writing binary subsume the hierarchies between nature and culture, feminine and masculine. These hierarchies feminize popular literature and masculinize literary writing. The popular-literature/literary-writing hierarchy supports the devaluation of romance narratives, domestic themes, and polemical or didactic content, at the same time as it elevates innovative form, abstraction, and intellectual content. This binary is implicated in cultural productions of all sorts, and it informs many of the choices made in the evolution of this dissertation.

The popular-literature/literary-writing binary articulates with manifestations of nationalist and anti-nationalist arguments in the English-Canadian literary field, such as the debate over literary standards, a debate which was taken up by Sandwell in 1919 and continued by Livesay in 1939. In Chapter 3, I claim that cultural nationalists like Sandwell and Macbeth are insufficiently credited for the material work they did in the development of a national Canadian literature. At the same time that I appreciate the under-acknowledged work performed by Sandwell, Macbeth, William Arthur Deacon, and the *Canadian Bookman*'s contributors, I also admire the social change activism of Livesay, Scott, and the *Canadian Forum* contributors. These interests have led me to consider the ways in which the political field and the literary field are articulated, and I try to understand the positions and position-takings of Canadian writers, within this articulation.

The cultural nationalism which I share with Macbeth derives, I believe, from my background as a civic nationalist, that is, someone who identifies with his or her country of birth rather than with an ethnic ancestry. In 1817 and 1850, my ancestors emigrated from Ireland to British North America. Little is known of the journey made in 1817 by the grandparents of Nellie Ryan, my great-grandmother, who married John Kelly (the same name given to my father), and nothing is known of my paternal ancestors. On my mother's side, Michael Moloughney and Ellen Murphy Moloughney, who arrived in Quebec in the spring of 1850, left their tenant farms in County Tipperary out of desperation after the potato famine; they took part in the nineteenth-century Irish diaspora. According to genealogist Edward MacLysaght, Moloughney is a name which is "one hundred percent Gaelic and no similar name is to be found in England," a comment that conjures up centuries of Irish English conflict (Moloughney 2). On the Moloughney side of my family, I am part of the fifth generation of Canadians, and on the maternal side of the Kelly family, I am in the seventh generation of Canadians. This long history of residence in Canada has loosened my family's relations to the old country. In 1976 I toured the Republic of Ireland before returning to Canada after a year in Europe, North Africa, and Asia. In Ireland, people whom I had just met would ask, "What part of Dublin are you from?" During that brief trip across Ireland from Dublin to Sligo and north to Donegal, I discovered that, although my physical resemblance to the Irish people was obvious to others, I felt no great affinity for them, and no sense of place in Ireland. My alienation was partly due to the traditional and subservient role relegated to Irish women, for I was dismayed by the rigid masculinism with which Irish feminists had to contend.

I am Canadian before I am Irish-Canadian; only a resentment over British oppression of Irish natives, and an appreciation for Gaelic music has persisted through these six generations since 1817. Along with Macbeth and many other Canadians, I am the ethnic rediscoverer of Isajiw's definition: some descendants of ethnic groups do not fully embrace the old world's ethnic identity. I have been successfully interpellated by the North American emphasis on consent over descent, which derives, I believe, from the emphasis on the individual that we find in liberal philosophy. In *Beyond Ethnicity*, Werner Sollors differentiates between descent and consent in terms of American liberal philosophy; he defines descent by such synonyms as "blood" and "ancestral," and consent by "free agents" and "contractual" (5-6). To express my position on unhyphenated Canadianism, I will modify Sollor's quotation of Michael Novak's words in *The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics: Politics and Culture in the Seventies*: "Given a grandparent or two, one chooses to shape one's consciousness by one history rather than another" (33). "One chooses to shape one's self-representation" would be closer to the truth, in my view, and thus modified, this sentence seems appropriate to a feminist standpoint. In patrilineal societies, daughters derive less power, recognition, or autonomy through family surnames than do sons. By de-emphasising patrilineal descent, I disassociate myself from a masculinist heritage as much as possible. Furthermore, consent articulates with civic nationalism by elevating patriotism to a federal state over loyalty to an ethnic group; thus, I choose my Canadian over my Irish heritage. Consent also emphasizes agency over determination, although not to the point of denying the power of interpellation. The articulation of consent with both the ideological construction of subjectivity and the ability of subjects to practise agency is important to my feminist standpoint. Finally, consent articulates with social constructionism by emphasizing environmental factors over blood relations. The national political events which took place in Canada during my youth have formed me more than my Celtic heritage. Such events as the Conservatives' acquiescence to American demands for a nuclear warhead base in Canada in 1958, the cancellation of Canadian production of the Avro Arrow airplane in 1959, the anti-Vietnam war movement of the 1960s, the substitution of the Canadian flag for the Union Jack in 1964, and the Centennial celebrations in 1967, all had a greater effect on my habitus than my tenuous connections to Ireland, and all affected my identity-formation long before I saw Ireland in 1975. I position myself among those Canadians who choose to identify themselves as unhyphenated Canadians in order to foreground their commitment to Canada over their roots elsewhere.

My interest in the role of nationalism in the literary field of 1920-1950 derives partly from this background. In Chapter 2, I address the permutations of civic nationalism and ethnic nationalism. I contest the assumption by theorists of the nation, such as Kristeva, Trudeau, Anderson, and Ignatieff, that all nationalisms are synonymous with political conservatism, although many politically conservative people are also nationalists.[31] Nationalism crosses the political spectrum. As Adam J. Lerner points out, "[t]here are numerous locations, including Finland and Poland, where the socialist parties were also the nationalist ones, particularly in the period between 1870 and 1918, but also in the last few decades" (538). Livesay, who was a member of the Communist Party of Canada from 1932 to 1939, was a cultural nationalist of varying degrees at certain points in her life, and many of her radical colleagues held nationalist and internationalist views concurrently. I explore their means of accomplishing this articulation in the pages that follow, especially in Chapter 4. Suffice it to say that my civic and cultural nationalisms do not prevent me from recognizing either the hypocrisy in Prime Minister Chretien's attempt to take credit, on behalf of the Liberal government, for turning Canada into "the greatest country in the world," or the immense value of unqualified nationalism, such as that perennially exhibited at July first celebrations, to those who oppose social change.[32] At the same time, and following Tom Nairn, I believe that counter nationalism is an elitist position of the intelligentsia, a position which reproduces the cosmopolitan hierarchy of imperial centre over regional and rural peripheries (*Faces of Nationalism* 48). Nairn coined the phrase counter nationalism as an alternative to anti-nationalism; he uses counter nationalism to refer to internationalism and theories of modernisation which pit modernism against ethnicity, and cosmopolitanism against provincialism. I use counter nationalism to refer mainly to internationalism or cosmopolitanism of the sort expressed by Michael Ignatieff in *Blood and Belonging* (1993), whose work I address more fully in Chapter 2. In the literary field, I agree with David Staines' claim that Canadians need to escape the "persistent opposition of international and provincial, world-class and Canadian, that still haunts critical attitudes towards our literary culture" (72).

My choice of the decades 1920-1950 arises partly from a desire to learn more about perceived similarities within differences between those years and the last decades of the twentieth century, especially in the areas of culture and the economy. Cultural nationalism has been part of the Canadian field of cultural production since Canada began to define itself against the United States within North America. In the period covered by this dissertation, the Americanization of Canadian culture was of concern both to continentalists and to nationalists in Canada. The film industry, the periodical press, and the broadcasting industry of the twenties and thirties were all negatively affected by competition with American magazines, film producers, and broadcasters. Today, the globalization of cultures is the Americanization of cultures; American cultural imperialism, assisted by capitalism's drive for a consumer society, has expanded since the earlier decades on which I focus in this project. In late 1997 a public debate in Canada over broadcasting standards exemplifies the continued relevance of cultural nationalism in our time period.[33] On November 11, 1997, the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council (CBSC) released a 56-page report on American radio personality Howard Stern and the relationship of his work to Canadian standards. The CBSC ordered two radio stations in

Montreal and Toronto, Q107 and CHOM, to announce in prime time that they had violated the standards of the Council by broadcasting Stern's program. Apparently, the CBSC received one thousand complaints from Canadians concerning the anti-French and misogynist statements made by Stern on the air. Ron Cohen, representative of the CBSC, said that Canadian community standards are different from those in the United States, and he claimed that Stern's racism and misogyny are unacceptable here. Cohen said that he expected the two radio stations to drop Stern from their programming schedules, in spite of the higher ratings they were recording. According to Cohen, refusal to follow CBSC directives would have material consequences for both radio stations, consequences such as ejection from the CBSC, an event which could compromise the licence renewal process before the Canadian Radio and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC). Moreover, also in late 1997, Heritage Minister Sheila Copps was in Europe defending Canada's decision to restrict the right of a large American music-recording company, Polygram, to distribute their products in Canada. An international board was examining Polygram's discrimination complaint against Canada, and in defence, Copps said that Polygram's product is all-American. She expected the European Economic Council's members to be sympathetic to Canada's position because, in her view, Europeans have also experienced the homogenization of their cultures under the influence of American multinational corporations. Both news items indicate the desire of those in the Canadian political field to differentiate the Canadian nation from the American nation, a desire which also operated within Canada between the two world wars; in addition, these recent events suggest that Canada's former colonial status at the level of politics persists in the areas of culture and economics, although in relation to different imperial centres.

Furthermore, the recession of the early 1980s, although not nearly as severe as the Great Depression, was, and still is, a problem for all sectors of society, especially for members of the under classes. Two characteristics of capitalism are evident in both these time periods: the cyclic nature of economic recessions and depressions, and the usefulness of a reserve army of female workers to capitalist economies. Canada's economic colonialism negatively affects Canadian workers through the instability of foreign investment, a branch plant economic structure, and the mimicry of American economic cycles. These factors tend to naturalize continentalism, the view of Canada as a North American nation. However, economic booms usually serve to support nationalism, and the period I am examining in this dissertation is marked by a boom-and-bust economic cycle similar to, yet more severe than, that of recent decades. The mid-twenties was a period of great technological and economic development until the crash of 1929 and, during both world wars, Canada experienced economic expansion. Similarly, the long period of economic prosperity between 1950 and 1981 meant that the recession of the eighties was a shock.[34] Both periods are also marked by the rise of nationalism. My interest in my parents' generation, one of the generations which survived the Great Depression of 1929 to 1939, left me with empathy for and curiosity about those cultural producers who lived through this time period.

Finally, the social history of Canada during the decades 1920-1950 is fascinating for its immense variety, development, and change in all areas of life. The success of the suffrage movement, the consolidation of the New Woman and maternal feminism, the tremendous increase in new technology, the rise of unionism and the social welfare system, the organization of alternative political parties, the occurrence of two world wars: all had a material impact on the development of Canadian culture and institutions. In 1923 fewer than 10,000 Canadian households had a radio but by 1929 this figure had mushroomed to 297,000.[35] In 1931, in spite of the economic depression, 33% of Canadian households reported owning a radio.[36] American journalist Tom Lapin states that the immense impact which the radio had on North American culture of the twenties and thirties resembles today's information technology revolution.[37] According to Lapin, in the 1920s, American public discourse about the radio was concerned about the following claims: the radio would transform society; the radio would either destroy youth or lead to a truer democracy through discursive freedom and increased public dialogue. As Lapin points out, similar claims are now made in relation to the internet, and, in both the case of the radio and the case of the internet, development of these new technologies is controlled by young, middle-class males. Earlier developments, such as the introduction of electricity, the telephone, the telegraph, and the airplane, impacted the role of middle-class Canadian women by empowering the independence of those who, like Macbeth, were attracted to the figure of the independent and mobile New Woman.

With regard to feminist concerns, the twenties stands in stark contrast to the thirties and forties. By 1922 all Canadian women, except those in Quebec, had achieved full voting rights, and, during the twenties, middle-class women entered the professions and universities at higher rates than ever before. The fashion image of most Canadian women was revolutionized in the 1920s by the replacement of the corset with the girdle and bra, by the popularity of short skirts and short hair, and by the widespread use of makeup. As Veronica Strong-Boag notes, "the flapper generation symbolized that sense of new beginning for women with which the postwar [WWI] decade began" (7). All this changed in the thirties and forties, when longer skirts and hairstyles returned, fewer women attended university, and fewer entered the workforce. Strong-Boag characterizes the thirties as a period when a backlash against feminism occurred, a backlash based on "reinvigorated fears about the survival of western civilization, the nuclear family, and traditional sex roles" (18). She also points to the "absence in these years of an articulate feminist movement that had nurtured the pioneers who had breached the male monopolies in the nineteenth century" (24). Both the persistence of misogynist attitudes that devalued women and their work, and widespread male unemployment forced women from the workforce, especially in the years immediately after both world wars. The federal government was the worst offender in the area of discrimination on the basis of sex within the workplace. In 1918 it allowed the Civil Service Commission "to set job competitions on the basis of sex," in order to protect returning war veterans from unemployment (Strong-Boag 62). In 1921, the federal government began the infamous practice of firing female employees upon marriage, a discriminatory practice that Livesay faced in the B.C. provincial government in 1937. As a result of the 1921 ruling, the number of women employed by the federal civil service immediately dropped by thirteen percent and the number of male employees rose by 6.5 percent (62). Thus, the Meighen government gained twofold: it gained popularity among the voting population by protecting veterans, and it gained financially by reducing the total number of employees on the federal civil service payroll.

This same time period was also the site of a drastic decrease in the income of Canadians. Between 1928 and 1933, the worst years of the Great Depression, the income of Canadians decreased by forty-eight percent, and in 1932 and 1933, twenty-six percent of Canadians were unemployed. By comparison, today the government (not the unemployed) expresses pleasure when the unemployment rate drops below ten percent.[38] A dramatic sign both of the economic boom in the decade of the 1920s and of the economic downturn in the decade of the 1930s is found in car registration statistics; the number of cars registered in Canada increased by five hundred percent in the twenties and only by ten percent in the thirties. These immense movements from boom to bust influenced the Canadian literary field in many ways, one of which was the Canadian Authors Association's lobbying efforts to reform Canadian copyright legislation in favour of cultural producers, a campaign which I discuss in Chapter 3.

Although there were many sharp contrasts between the twenties on the one hand, and the thirties and forties on the other, there are also many overall similarities. Strong-Boag's comment on the "reinvigorated fears about the survival of western civilization" in the thirties suggests the persistence of imperialist concerns over the condition and dominance of the Anglo-Saxon `race.' In addition, nationalism continued to be an important theme in Canada during the thirties and forties. In the nonliterary field, the formation of the Canadian Girls in Training (CGIT) in 1917, and their continued popularity in the thirties, strikes me as an example of the intersection of Canadian nationalism with gender, and of the persistence of nationalism through the depression years. The CGIT was a nationalist movement in that it was formed as a Canadian alternative to the Girl Guide movement, which CGIT representatives considered to be "too competitive, authoritarian, secular, and British" (Strong-Boag 29). The principle of maternal feminism is evident in the CGIT's beliefs that women's "role in national development" was important to Canada, and that Canadian women had a contribution to make to the development of world peace (29, 32). The complex relationship between nationalism and internationalism in Canada, which I address in Chapters 3 and 4, operates in the CGIT. In the literary field, *The Canadian Bookman* (1919-1939) was a major forum for discussions on the relation between literature and nation-building. In both 1924 and 1933, debates over the development of a Canadian literary canon took place in this "monthly devoted to literature and the creative arts" (masthead of *The Canadian Bookman*). In 1924, Lionel Stevenson's "Manifesto for a National Literature," which appeared in the February issue, motivated two other writers to submit articles in response.[39] In the August 1933 issue, L.M. Dickson's article on the Canadian literary field sparked a debate which continued until December and involved four writers.[40] Both Livesay and Macbeth made public statements on their views of the intersections between nationalism and literature. Their position-takings are closely examined in the chapters that follow.

Chapter 2

Theoretical Approaches to a Materialist-Feminist Study of the Canadian Literary Field, 1920-1950

Three main strands of theory provide the framework for this dissertation: theories of cultural production, materialist feminism, and theories of nationalisms. Pierre Bourdieu's theoretical framework provides several useful concepts for the analysis of the literary field in Western cultures, concepts such as the artistic generation, symbolic capital, and the field of cultural production. His relational approach to texts, historical materialism, power, and culture has led to the development of a theoretical model which invites engagement by feminist theorists and Canadian literary critics. In this chapter I use Bourdieu's cultural theories to discuss the popular-literature/literary-writing dichotomy, which, according to Raymond Williams, derives from sixteenth-century distinctions between upper and lower classes in England, and I suggest ways in which this broad binary is implicated in the Canadian literary field of 1920-1950. I also draw key concepts and methodologies from the materialist-feminist work of Rosemary Hennessy, Teresa Ebert, Sandra Harding, Bridget Elliott and Jo-Ann Wallace, Janet Wolff, Sylvia Walby, and Christine Delphy, many of whom focus on the masculinist nature of the material conditions faced by female cultural producers in patriarchal societies. Following these writers, I consider concrete factors related to Livesay's and Macbeth's literary production, factors such as their income and the incidence of the publication of writing by Canadian women in the Canadian literary field. Finally, theories of nationalism are essential to this project because the construction of a national literature and debates over definitions and standards of Canadian Literature are central to the Canadian literary field of 1920-1950, a field in which nationalists, internationalists, modernists, and Victorians competed. In E.J. Hobsbawm's terms, the 1920s and 1930s make up a "crucial moment" in the history of Canadian nationalism; during this period of the twentieth century, nationalism became a mass movement (12). Livesay and Macbeth, whose positions in relation to nationalism changed over time, were both closely involved in these events. Moreover, feminist theories of nationalisms are important for an understanding of Canadian women writers in the context of a nationalist period of Canadian history and of the literary field.

A. CULTURAL MATERIALISM

Pierre Bourdieu's Literary Theory

Pierre Bourdieu is a major, internationally acclaimed figure in the discipline of sociology. He was born into a lower-middle-class family in 1930 in Denguin, a small town in southeastern France; his father was a civil servant. Trained first as a teacher at the *École normale supérieure* in Paris, Bourdieu began his social science career in the field of anthropology during his military service in France's colony, Algeria, 1956-1958. Upon his return to the imperial centre, Bourdieu taught at the University of Paris; he also studied Marx and was a student in the courses that Lévi-Strauss gave at the *Collège de France*. In 1964, Bourdieu was appointed Director of Studies at *l'École pratique des hautes études* and in 1968 he began his directorship of the *Centre de Sociologie Européenne*, where the respected journal *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* is produced. As Richard Jenkins comments, "A research grouping began to accrete around Bourdieu; in the rarefied intellectual cockpit of Paris he became a *patron*" (15). As Chair of the *Collège de France* since 1981, "the most senior chair in sociology in France," Bourdieu is currently at the top of his field (Jenkins 13).

Bourdieu's theory of literature calls for a "diacritical reading" of texts, one that draws on both internal analytical methods, such as New Criticism and deconstruction, and external analytical methods, such as Marxism, biography, intertextuality, cultural studies, and New Historicism (*In Other Words* 147). Bourdieu's work is informed by existentialism, psychoanalysis, sociology, and Marxism; his rhetoric especially shows evidence of the influence of sociologist Max Weber. Following Weber, Bourdieu transposes liturgical language from the field of theology to the field of cultural production. For instance, he uses consecration to indicate the high esteem and power acquired by established writers in the literary field. But, as Bridget Fowler points out, "Despite Weber's stress on the continuities between art and religion, his *theory of religious interests* treats the emergence of charismatic prophets as though they are entirely independent individuals," whereas Bourdieu emphasizes the simultaneous determination and agency of each subject-position within a complex series of fields (emphasis in original 52). Bourdieu is not the first to use theological language in the literary field; the term canon derives from ecclesiastical rhetoric.

Central to Bourdieu's theoretical model is the concept of the field, defined as an area of endeavour, a discourse community, or an institutional space. In any field, such as the field of cultural production, agents compete for positions of prominence and for rewards of symbolic or economic capital. Each field is located within the larger field of class relations, in which other fields arrange themselves hierarchically and compete for dominance. The field of power represents the state and powerful economic interests; it is subsumed within the field of class, and acts as a secondary umbrella field over all other fields. In Bourdieu's model of fields, history is an ubiquitous presence which must be accounted for by the researcher; for instance, the presuppositions which are prerequisites for entrance to any field are historically constructed. Furthermore, a historically constructed hierarchy and a continuous struggle operate within each field, and the relations of power resulting from struggles between fields are contingent on historical factors. Rogers Brubaker points out that Bourdieu's concept of the field invites the discussion of institutions, people's practices, and the relations between them in one "particular `social space,'" rather than separately (222). On the other hand, Jenkins criticizes Bourdieu for under analyzing institutions (89-90).

Bourdieu's hierarchical approach to fields of cultural production intersects with materialism in the following way. Within the literary field, subfields can be either heteronomous or autonomous, that is, either dependent on the market or independent of the market. In *The Field of Cultural Production*, Bourdieu explains that "the *heteronomous* principle of hierarchization...is *success* [and] the *autonomous* principle of hierarchization...is *degree specific consecration* (literary or artistic prestige)" (38). Bourdieu defines success as achieving awards in the public arena, having a play performed for a long run, or getting on the best-sellers' list. Consecration, or canonization, is an insular operation because it respects only the favourable opinion of the members of a select group, such as literary writers and critics, avant-garde artists, or experimental writers. Consecration usually attaches to writers, artists, or musicians who introduce new forms which attack the norm and alienate the ordinary, uninitiated person; these agents are usually found in the restricted subfield of each field of cultural production (*Field* 38-39). According to Bourdieu, success is usually found in the subfield of large scale production, such as the publication of popular literature or the production of pop music. However, there is no rigid or clear distinction between the restricted and large scale subfields, a fact which facilitates the discussion of marginal artists or transitional phases within a writer's works. For instance, Livesay wrote poetry in the restricted subfield, but her work was published by major publishers of popular literature, Ryerson Press and Macmillan Canada, and she received two Governor-General's Awards; the publishers and the awards operate in the large scale subfield. Livesay also wrote highly partisan literature for the Communist Party of Canada (CPC), an activity that belongs in the restricted subfield. In these various position-takings, Livesay traverses subfields within the Canadian literary field of production. Furthermore, Bourdieu's view of success must be considered within cultural and historical contexts. The small size of the English Canadian literary market, as compared to the larger English-language audiences in the United States and Britain, restricts the sales of a successful Canadian writer of popular literature; consequently, Canadian writers try to publish concurrently in all three markets. Moreover, due to the colonized status of Canada's literary field, the success of a Canadian book in the Canadian market is partly dependent upon its success in the literary field of the imperial centres.

Bourdieu situates the field of culture in relation to the field of power, and the field of power in relation to the field of class. My project seeks to decentre class from this privileged position. Class functions in a complex relationship with other identity factors; it should not be considered in isolation. Toril Moi suggests that "we may try to see both class and gender as belonging to the 'whole social field' without specifying a fixed and unchangeable hierarchy between them" (1035). In this way, she writes, "we might be able to seize the complex *variability* of these social factors as well as the way in which they influence and modify each other in different social contexts" (1035). In their materialist analyses, Rosemary Hennessy, Janet Wolff, Joan Kelly, Bridget Elliott and Jo-Ann Wallace, Donna Landry and Gerald MacLean state that gender, race, and sexual orientation should be given the same weight and consideration that class currently receives. In a multicultural country such as Canada, ethnicity is another important factor.

I want to apply Moi's insight to all these factors. Not only do gender, class, race, sexual orientation, and ethnicity contribute to the formation of the habitus, but they also cross all fields to impinge on the positions available to an agent as well as on his or her position-taking in each field. Each of these factors functions differently in relation to each other and to the field of power, and in relation to the specific time, place, and subject-position of the agent being considered. I see the factors traditionally used to define class, that is, kinship, education, income, occupation, and geographical location, operating in a mutual relationship of power which also affects the factors of sexual identity, race, ethnicity, and gender. In the West, race, sexual orientation, and gender influence what an agent *gets* in terms of kinship, education, income, occupation, and geographical location; at the same time, these latter factors signify what an agent *has* in terms of class. In some cases, the power relationship between identity markers moves in both directions simultaneously. Gender, race, and sexual orientation may determine one's choice of an adult partner, but one's kinship at birth is an earlier determining factor. For instance, regardless of whether sexual orientation is genetic or learned, children in patriarchal social systems face the pressures of compulsory heterosexuality.

Before proceeding with my outline of Bourdieu's literary theory, I want to discuss two of these factors, race and ethnicity. There are major similarities between race and ethnicity, such as the fact that kinship figures in both concepts, and both are culturally constructed; however, in racist cultures, the mark of skin colour has an immediate effect on the material reality of an agent's life. A white Canadian of Chilean, South African, or European ancestry, for example, has more choices and mobility in the employment market than does an African-, Asian- or Native-Canadian, even though members of all these groups may face discrimination in a workforce which consists largely of Anglo-

Saxon Canadians. Although cultural factors such as language, religion, customs, and the arts define ethnicity, they also figure in the construction of race. As American philosopher David Goldberg observes, connections made between skin colour and race are in fact "social choice[s]" in which biology is confused with "a range of encultured characteristics that include (but need not be limited to) modes of dress, bearing, gait, hairstyle, speech, and their relation" (75, 74). Goldberg calls this category "ethnorace" (74-78). The work of American sociologists Michael Omi and Howard Winant concurs with Goldberg's. In *Racial Formation in the United States From the 1960s to the 1990s*, Omi and Winant state, "there is no biological basis for distinguishing among human groups along the lines of race," and they refer to scientific studies which indicate that there are as many genetic differences between members of a racial group as there between members of different races (183-184 note 27).

Omi and Winant claim that ethnicity has been "the dominant paradigm of race for the last half-century" in the United States (12). The problem with this paradigm, they point out, is that subsuming race in ethnicity ignores differences between the history of contact between white Europeans and Americans and the history of contact between Africans, Asians, and Natives with American settlers. Africans, Asians, and Natives had to contend with slavery and genocide, whereas white European immigrants did not. Thus, Sollor's concept of consent, the choice of some immigrants to favour a North American future over a European past, is more relevant in discussions of ethnicity than in discussions of race. Incidents of state oppression, such as the one-drop legal stipulation in the United States and the internment of Japanese Canadians during WWII, exemplify the lack of consent available to these racial groups at certain historical moments. Although race and ethnicity are often conflated in public discourse, it seems to me that a clear understanding of historical events and contexts will be assisted by disentangling such conflations.

An example of the historical conflation of race and ethnicity by Canadians is found in nineteenth-century Nova Scotia, where Irish immigrants were racialized as "black Irish," or as "slaves" (Johnston 26; Punch 16). Here I am using Goldberg's definition of racialization as "any and all significance extended both explicitly and silently by racial reference over discursive expression and practice" (2). Terence Punch's research shows that the stereotype of the drunk and lazy Irish, a stereotype which was perpetrated by leading Canadian literary figures such as Thomas Chandler Haliburton, is not reflected in statistics. Punch did a survey of Halifax's court statistics between 1846 and 1871 and discovered that the incidence of alcoholism and criminal activity among the Irish was lower than the proportion of their numbers in the population (Punch 18-21). The negative stereotype of Irish immigrants in nineteenth-century Nova Scotia was related to cultural differences and political conflicts between the hegemony of loyal imperialists in Protestant British North America and the minority of anti-imperialist Catholic Irish immigrants. The discursive racialization of the Irish in nineteenth-century Nova Scotia served to naturalize the power imbalance between these two groups (Johnston 27-28). The development of the emphasis of consent over descent by twentieth-century Irish Canadians such as myself has likely been influenced by this history of racialization.

In addition to the fluidity between the categories of race and ethnicity, there are similarities in arguments over the biological essence or social construction of race and gender. These two factors share a remarkably similar risk of essentialism, a risk to which the concept of ethnicity is not exposed to the same degree; biological descent is one factor among many in the delineation of ethnicity, whereas biology is central to discussions of both race and gender. Although Goldberg, Omi and Winant, and others contend that there are no biological essences to race, ethnicity, or gender, theorists such as sociobiologists use biology to naturalize the social construction of race and gender.[41] Furthermore, as Goldberg states, social science disciplines engaged in research on race relations assume that a biological incapacity for rationality is the underlying cause of racism: in this argument, racism is an irrational belief that occurs on an individual basis (92-94). Such reasoning resembles the claim that Marc Lepine, who murdered fourteen female engineering students in Montreal in 1989, was a madman. By focusing on the individual act as an anomaly, this argument rationalizes such incidents, and avoids acknowledging the systemic misogyny that necessarily underlies them.

Capital and Its Symbolic Associations

In line with his overall Marxist world-view, capital is an important analytical factor in Bourdieu's theoretical model. Bourdieu extends Marxist theory by considering "immaterial forms of capital - cultural, symbolic, and social - as well as a material or economic form" (Calhoun 69). Bourdieu accepts Marx's definition of capital as "accumulated labour" but he abstracts this very material term by using it to mean "that energy of social physics" (Singer 24,48; *Invitation* 118,119). American critic Craig Calhoun believes that Bourdieu "sees capital simply as a resource (that is, a form of wealth) which yields power" (69). For instance, the state possesses "meta-capital, which allows [it] to wield a power over the different fields and over the various forms of capital that circulate in them" (*Invitation* 114). In contrast, Marx focuses on how the owner uses capital to create surplus value or profit. In other words, Bourdieu's model assumes capitalism as a given, whereas Marx analyzes the rise and fall of capitalism as an economic system.

Bourdieu defines social capital as "the sum of the resources, actual or virtual, that accrue to an individual or a group by virtue of possessing a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance or recognition" (*Invitation* 119). For example, J.F.B. Livesay founded and managed the Canadian Press news service and was well positioned to assist his daughter's entry into the field of journalism. In 1929, the senior Livesay arranged for a summer job as a reporter for Dorothy at the Winnipeg *Tribune*, his former employer; in 1932, Livesay wrote to her father from France and asked him to use his influence to get her a journalism job in London, England.[42] In Winnipeg, Livesay found that her father's intervention backfired on her; she "felt there was a certain hostility emanating from newspaper editors" (*Journey* 97). "Father's pet," she writes, "was the last thing I wanted to be" (97). J.F.B. Livesay also solicited reviews for Livesay's early volumes of poetry, *Green Pitcher* (1928) and *Signpost* (1932). As Pamela Banting comments in "Daddy's Girl: Dorothy Livesay's Correspondence with her Father,"

> In the Dafoe Library Archives [at the University of Manitoba], there is a large stack of carbon copies of letters he wrote to every newspaper in Canada, enclosing a copy of his daughter's book and requesting the kindness of a review. He was at

> the time General Manager of the Canadian Press and in a position of enormous power and influence. (20)[43]

J.F.B. Livesay's letters to editors represent symbolic pressure. Not only was he senior to local newspaper editors by virtue of his position in a national agency, but he also controlled the daily news feeds on which local news editors depended for national and international news copy. Similarly, Charles Macbeth's personal friendship with William Lyon Mackenzie King gave Macbeth access to the political circles which became the subject of her writing and the source of her income after her husband's premature death.

Public recognition of Livesay as a blossoming poet, in the reviews solicited by her father, enabled Livesay to accrue symbolic cultural capital, which, according to Bourdieu, is "grasped through categories of perception that recognize its specific logic, or, if you prefer, misrecognize the arbitrariness of its possession and accumulation" (*Invitation* 119). The question that interests me is whether symbolic capital, which Bourdieu says is "another name for distinction," is easily convertible into symbolic power by everyone in the literary field (Bourdieu in LiPuma 29). I would argue that the factors of gender, race, class, ethnicity, and sexual orientation overdetermine the conversion process from symbolic capital to symbolic power. An investigation into how gender affects these potential conversions and, specifically, whether the female/feminine sex/gender nexus was a handicap in the Canadian field of literary production, 1920-1950, is integral to the parameters of my project. In Chapter 5, I argue that gender functioned as a category of exclusion when Livesay's poetry was omitted from *New Provinces*, which was edited by two Rhodes' scholars, Scott and A.J.M. Smith (1909-1980). Neither Livesay's symbolic cultural capital, nor her social capital, nor Smith's recommendations could prevail against Scott's and Macmillan's decision to exclude from the anthology the voice of the only published, modernist, Canadian, woman poet of their literary generation.

Symbolic violence, important for the domination of any field or time period by specific players, may be used against marginalized participants to keep them decentred, and may be used against newcomers to ensure that those in power remain in power. Bourdieu defines symbolic violence as

> an act of cognition and of misrecognition that lies beyond - or beneath - the controls of consciousness and will, in the obscurities of the schemata of habitus that are at once gendered and gendering...I call misrecognition the fact of recognizing [acknowledging] a violence which is wielded precisely inasmuch as one does not perceive it as such. (*Invitation* 168, 171-172)

Following Bourdieu's work in *Distinction*, Moi states that "*Taste* or *judgment* are the heavy artillery of symbolic violence" (1026). In his misogynist poem, "The Canadian Authors Meet," Scott uses taste to denigrate Victorian poetry and to feminize the Canadian Authors Association (CAA). However, the canonization of this poem constitutes a greater symbolic violence, because canonization legitimates and perpetuates the misogynist discourse of the original act of symbolic violence, the poem itself. I address the misogyny of the poem more fully in Chapter 5, as well as its role in the distinction between Canadian literary generations.

Edward LiPuma points out that "symbolic capital is ultimately convertible into economic capital" within Bourdieu's system, but this conversion is mediated by many factors, including time; femininity is one other factor (29). Elizabeth Lyons held social capital, symbolic power, and a large fortune through her membership in the patrilineal American upper class. Her loss of the family fortune through her performance of femininity in relation to finances exemplifies my point. The symbolic capital generated by Macbeth's writing made no material improvement to the family's lifestyle; for many years, Macbeth capitalized on her social capital to eke out a living as a journalist. The symbolic capital gained from Macbeth's novels was modest, partly because her frequent use of pseudonyms prevented any immediate benefit that may have followed from their success in the literary field.

Macbeth maintained her social capital in the upper echelons of the British-Canadian class system, even after Charles' death and Elizabeth's financial losses. In a diary entry dated December 3, 1939, Macbeth describes being invited to 24 Sussex Drive for dinner, many years after Charles's death, because Prime Minister King needed a single woman for a dinner at which he was host to the Papal Delegate and several prelates. "Mr.

King phoned to thank me for "making the party a success," she writes, "by which he probably meant that I wasn't cowed by the ecclesiastical atmosphere" (NAC MG30 D52 Vol.17 p.52). Macbeth was a friend of two wives of Governors-General (Lady Bessborough and Lady Tweedsmuir, wife of novelist John Buchan); her name was on their invitation lists. She appreciated "the atmosphere of ritual and formality" at Government House, and she accused her Canadian contemporaries who described the Governor-General's residence as "a stronghold of pomp and snobbishness" of an inability to match its high standards in "graciousness, culture," and etiquette (*Boulevard Career* 90, 91). Macbeth was well aware of the social capital she earned by her attendance at the Governor-General's functions, even though she did not place this symbolic capital in the context of a class analysis. "Government House, like the Royal Society, like scholarships," she writes, "was a reward for special qualifications. Like a University Degree, one had to prepare to enjoy its privileges" (*Boulevard Career* 91). Macbeth also drew on this relational capital for material in her fiction and journalism. Her social-political satire *The Land of Afternoon* was a sensation in 1924 because the characters were easily identifiable; Conservative leader Arthur Meighen and his wife were the models for the protagonists. In addition, Macbeth wrote an article about Mackenzie King titled "The Boy Minister," and in a travel article on Mallorca, Spain, she mentions "Dr. and Mrs. Duncan Campbell Scott" and "Mr. P.D. Lyons, President of the Rideau Lawn Tennis Club, Vice-President of the Canadian and the Ontario Lawn Tennis Associations, [who] holds as well some executive position on the Davis Cup Team" among the famous Canadians who were visiting Mallorca at the time of her visit (NAC MG30 D52 Vol.9). Scott was an established poet, and P.D. Lyons was Phillip Douglas Lyons of Ottawa, Macbeth's brother. Macbeth's lack of acknowledgment of their family relationship in the typescript indicates both her place in the Canadian upper classes and her willingness to draw on this relational capital as material for her source of income, professional writing.

Literary or Artistic Generations

> *Revolt is essential to progress, not necessarily the revolt of violence, but always the revolt that questions the established past and puts it to the proof, that finds the old forms outworn and invents new forms for new matters.* (D.C. Scott 142)

People try to put us down
Just because we get around
Things they do look awful cold
I hope I die before I get old.

Why don't you all fade away
And don't try to dig what we all say
I'm not trying to cause a big sensation
I'm just talkin' 'bout my generation.

(The Who "My Generation")

The literary or artistic generation is a simple and only slightly developed concept in Bourdieu's model, but I have found his idea to be very useful in understanding the Canadian literary field of 1920-1950, both spatially and temporally. Literary generations are organized around the struggles that define a field. A group of writers may form a literary generation by distinguishing themselves from their precursors through innovations in form or content. These innovations may not differ radically from the established practice; therefore, the new group does not necessarily constitute a movement. In Chapter 4, I delineate two movements and three literary generations amongst Canadian poets in the period 1920-1950; the distinction between the Victorian poets and the modernists constitutes the distinction between two movements, but finer distinctions within the Victorian and modernist movements are facilitated by the concept of the generation. Furthermore, in a global cultural field, the New World constitutes the next generation following the Old World, and in the colonized Canadian cultural field of the first half of this century, Canadian cultural producers were self-conscious about "'gain[ing] a sense of [literary] freedom in the New World'" (Sime in Lecker, "Watson and Pierce's..." 78). Therefore, Canadian writers of the period 1920-1950 work on two planes within each artistic generation, that of their ethnic literary heritage(s) and that of their Canadian literary identity.

The literary generation is a site of struggle for recognition on the part of the newcomers to the field. As Bourdieu explains, "On one side are the dominant figures, who want continuity, identity, reproduction; on the other, the newcomers, who seek discontinuity, rupture, difference, revolution" (*Field of Cultural Production* 106). Bourdieu states that during periods of rapid developments in the field of cultural production, two literary or artistic generations could be a mere few years apart. Although members of one literary generation can theoretically range from the aged to the youthful, this seldom occurs, except in the case of intellectuals' alliances with radical youth movements (*Field* 105). According to Bourdieu's conception of them, literary generations are not necessarily concurrent with chronological generations, but members of an artistic generation may be of similar age. Dorothy and Florence Livesay each belong to different literary generations; theirs is one case in which artistic generation follows chronological generation.

Homogeneity does not exist within Canadian literary generations any more than it does within the Canadian society at large. The factors of race, class, gender, sexual orientation, and ethnicity mediate the artistic generation, as they do all other sectors of a field. Gender distinguishes the Livesays' literary generations from others because this mother and daughter do not exhibit the same degree of rivalry that is evident between masculine literary generations, such as John Sutherland's conflict with A.J.M. Smith, which I explain more fully in Chapter 5. Furthermore, as Bourdieu points out, women are often located by their peers in a younger artistic generation and are expected to fulfil the role of "*mediator between the dominant and dominated fractions* (which they have always played, particularly through the 'salon')" (*Field* 287 note 43, emphasis in original). Livesay's vocation was nurtured by the literary salon held by her mother at their summer home, Woodlot, in Clarkson, Ontario (now Mississauga).

The structure and history of the field is defined partly by its literary or artistic generations. Bourdieu states:

> the various artists or writers are distributed at every moment according to their artistic age, i.e. according to the age of their mode of artistic production and the degree to which this generative scheme, which is also a scheme of perception and

> appreciation, has been canonized and secularized. (*Field* 107)

Established literary generations and movements, each of which were considered usurpers when they entered the field, are more likely to be part of the literary canon. In addition, each literary or artistic generation has an impact on the literary market and, therefore, on the taste of the audience. Members of a literary generation are drawn to the same publisher(s) and tend to appear in the same journals and anthologies. The impact by a specific literary generation on market demand may or may not be immediate; however, it can result in a new line of literary products being offered by publishers and demanded by readers, a new line which implicitly dates the work of the consecrated literary generation.

A problem encountered by non-French readers lies in Bourdieu's focus on the French culture; he does not consider cross cultural analyses. In "The Production of Belief," Bourdieu writes, in the context of contemporary artistic generations in the French art scene, "Each major gallery was an avant-garde gallery at some time or other" (*Field* 107). Such a claim cannot be made universally; it is specific to the French situation under discussion. In "Social Theory as Habitus," Brubaker criticizes Bourdieu for "present[ing] his social theory as a "universal anthropology,"" and asks, "is it in fact entirely domain-indifferent?" (229).[44] British sociologist Bridget Fowler offers American sociologist M. Lamont's *Money, Morals and Manners: The Culture of the French and American Upper Middle Class* (1992) as proof of the problems inherent in a cross-cultural application of Bourdieu's model. According to Fowler, Lamont

> identifies certain key differences between France and America ...differences [which], she argues, have resulted in greater inequality of wealth in France, fewer chances of social mobility, less ethnic diversity - and also in less stress on money as a form of social closure than on differences based on cultural distinction. (9)

Considering that Bourdieu developed his concepts from studies of French culture and society, it seems reasonable to assume that cultural differences will mediate the application of his model to other societies. The lack of homogeneity in most nations, including

Canada, complicates the transference of Bourdieu's concepts and speaks to the preference of feminist social scientists for beginning at the local level.

On the other hand, similarities between industrialized nations exist, and these are recognizable through Bourdieu's model. In his discussion of the French publishing industry, the case of Gallimard resembles that of Hugh Eayrs's leadership of Macmillan Canada, which published textbooks as a means of financing literature during the 1920s and 1930s.[45] The following statement, which Bourdieu makes about Gallimard, can also be applied to Macmillan Canada under Hugh Eayrs: "the organization appropriate for producing, marketing and promoting one category of products is totally unsuited for the other" (*Field* 104). Bourdieu's critics differ over his model's cross-cultural applicability. Calhoun sees the alienation of the modern individual in "complex or differentiated societies" as good reason for the cross-cultural application of a concept like the field (77). According to Calhoun, the field provides a space for the analysis of societies in which traditional connections such as kinship and religion no longer operate (77). Other concepts resembling the field have been used cross-culturally by Bourdieu's sociological predecessors, "from Weber onwards," but Bourdieu does not acknowledge their work, according to Jenkins (89, 167).

Many writers criticize Bourdieu's work for leaving little room for social transformation.[46] Many others see his model as deterministic.[47] There are good arguments to be made for both sides, but these arguments and critiques must be contextualized within the parameters of the highly competitive fields of academia and publishing. I do not mean to imply that Bourdieu's critics and supporters choose to write about his work *only* to produce a marketable item; however, even though the movement of the American postsecondary educational system towards an emphasis on teaching over research and writing is affecting other English-speaking educational systems, the publish or perish rule still operates in academia. Just as Bourdieu either rejected or drew on the work of his predecessors, his own critics take positions in relation to his work. This process illustrates the value, stature, and importance of Bourdieu's work. Furthermore, all the participants in the public dialogue over Bourdieu's work constitute generations of sociologists and cultural analysts, generations that operate in the field of academia the way that Bourdieu's concept of artistic generations operates in the field of cultural production. The simplicity and abstraction of the concept of literary, academic, or discursive generations makes it particularly appropriate for engagement across cultures.

In addition, the positions taken in relation to Bourdieu's theory are mediated by the political position-takings of the same critics, both in the field of politics and in the field of academia. For example, the writers whose work is collected in *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives* (Calhoun, Wacquant, LiPuma, Postone et al) are neo-Marxists who favour social change. Morag Shiach, on the other hand, is part of the cultural studies movement in the U.K., a movement which she envisions as wanting "to constitute itself as a site of resistance or transgression within institutions of education," and her chief complaint centres on Bourdieu's emphasis on "the game of distinction" and on his neglect of alternative strategies for agents in this field (214, 215). However, although he seems pessimistic on the subject of change within educational institutions, Bourdieu's line of argument suggests dissatisfaction with the status quo, a dissatisfaction that situates him to the left of centre. Jenkins, and some of the critics he quotes, appear to place themselves to the right of Bourdieu, Calhoun et al, Fowler, and Shiach. For instance, Jenkins and Connell argue that "social reproduction as a model of how capitalist society manages to keep the working class quiescent is probably *wrong*," because they see the working class as a powerful class in late capitalism, whereas Bourdieu does not (Jenkins 118). Jenkin's work suggests a middle-class bias reminiscent of nineteenth-century British fears about the rising numbers of the working class. I agree with Bourdieu's assessment of the hierarchy of classes, and I use it to situate writers in the literary field.

Popular Literature and Pure Art[48]

> *Literature in its purest form is vowed to the service of the imagination; its ethical powers are secondary, though important; and it cannot be forced to prove its utility.* (D.C. Scott 126)

> *[P]oetry...dwells in a world of its own creation, obeying no laws but its own and paying homage to no external god, king, or country.* (F.R. Scott "New Poems" 298)

The artificial binary of popular literature versus pure art acts as a defining characteristic of fields of cultural production in Western thought. This dichotomy is an ideological template which reproduces arbitrary standards of value for the cultural field, standards of value which represent, among other value systems, the masculinist world view of those in control of the field of power. As I have argued, the field of power is indebted to masculinist biases and systems of thought, systems which also operate in the cultural field. Forms of representation can be visualized by audiences, cultural producers, and cultural critics at various locations along the popular-literature/pure-art continuum. Symbolic power and material rewards accrue to those involved in the production of forms of representation which conform to the underlying masculinist assumptions of this ideological system. The marginalization and exclusion of feminine, soft, emotional, domestic art forms, and the idealization and centralization of masculine, hard, abstract, public art forms defines such a literary field; furthermore, the popular end of the continuum is feminized within masculinist ideology.

The femininity of mass culture and the masculinity of high culture proceed historically, according to Andreas Huyssen, from middle-class anxiety about a potential revolt of the English-speaking working class. In *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism*, Huyssen maintains that the woman's suffrage struggle was seen both as part of this potential revolution and as a threat to the masculinist political hegemony (52). He links the theories of masculinist thinkers such as Freud and Marx not only to the tenets of modernism, but also to the devaluation of the feminine. In psychoanalysis, the ego, which represents individuality, rules, and masculinity, is privileged over the id, which represents the unconscious, sexuality, and femininity; in

Marxism, active production is more important than passive consumption. "The problem," writes Huyssen, "is rather the persistent gendering as feminine of that which is devalued" (53). In his reflections on the position of modernist poetry in the Canadian literary field of the 1930s, Scott fulfills Huyssen's observation:

> Violent hostility has ceased in educated communities, though in Canada the modernist still has to endure the derision of ageing critics as well as the indifference of the bourgeoisie of poetry readers who pull up their *Golden Treasury* skirts and pass him by on the other side. ("New Poems" 297)

In this passage, Scott feminizes the bourgeoisie, popular literature, and previous literary generations at the same time as he masculinizes poets, modernism, and his own literary generation. The implication is that only young, cosmopolitan, upper-class, European-educated, and anticapitalist males are enlightened enough to admit modernist poetry into the literary canon. Scott's devaluation of nonmodernist positions through the tactic of feminization constitutes part of his literary generation's strategy to create a prominent place for themselves in the Canadian literary field.

In *Keywords*, Raymond Williams traces the use of popular from the fifteenth century to the twentieth century. He writes:

> Popular culture was not identified by *the people* but by others, and it still carries two older senses: inferior kinds of work (cf popular literature, popular press as distinguished from *quality press*); and work deliberately setting out to win favour (popular journalism as distinguished from *democratic journalism*, or popular entertainment); as well as the more modern sense of well-liked by many people, with which of course, in many cases, the earlier senses overlap. (237)

Popular literature writers may work in many genres and media - journalism, radio, romance, historical novel, adventure novel, drama - which are designed to reach a large audience and to produce a profit. As do producers of literary writing, popular literature writers derive personal satisfaction from their work, but part of this satisfaction, presumably, comes from the sale of the work, which signals not only success but also professional status.

In the popular-literature/literary-writing dichotomy, poetry is the quintessential literary form; it holds this privileged position, according to Elliott and Wallace, for political reasons (74). Elliott and Wallace adopt Celeste Schenck's description of genres as "overdetermined loci of contention and conflict" versus "ideal literary types that transcendentally precede and predetermine a literary work" (74). As I discuss in Chapter 4, the distinction between Victorian nature poetry and modernist poetry was a major bone of contention in the Canadian literary field of 1920-1950. Williams points out that "there was an early regular contrast between art and nature: that is, between the product of human skill and the product of some inherent quality [in the human]" (*Keywords* 42). The inherent quality was artistic talent, a socially situated outcome of education and culture; in essentialist ideology, culture is constructed as a masculine concept that opposes nature, which is feminine. Stereotyped perceptions of gender roles and of biologically based capacities of the sexes may have influenced many Canadian modernists' rejection of nature themes in the writing of the Confederation poets, even though many successful nature poets were male. Furthermore, these stereotypes hold that the natural world does not demand a great deal of intellectual activity, merely attention to the senses, an activity that is perceived to be feminine. A focus on sensibility is characteristic of both Romanticism and of gendered perspectives on nature. In combination, the Romantic aspects of nature poetry and the feminization of nature by culture formed powerful motivations for the masculinist modernist movement's position-taking against Romanticism, against the old and traditional forms.

The most radical artists are the (masculine) *avant-garde* intellectuals, those who create art for their peers, and who comment upon the forms and institutions of art through their productions. I locate *avant-garde* or experimental art at the far left end of the popular-literature/pure-art continuum. However, in art theorist Peter Burger's model, the *avant-garde* is not even on this continuum; it is entirely independent of all art, artistic regulation, and monetary gain. Literary writing participates in the literary establishment; like *avant-garde* literature, it is directed to the writer's literary peers and the producer does not consider monetary return, but literary writing is not necessarily critical of the institution of literature. Both literary and *avant-garde* writers hold a great deal of cultural capital within the literary field. Writers of popular literature, such as Macbeth, garner the least amount of symbolic capital; however, *avant-garde* literature and popular literature have this in common: both are less likely than literary writing to be integrated into the literary canon during the period of their production. Livesay, a literary writer, achieved a great deal of cultural capital over the course of her writing career, but she was never materially wealthy; although she maintained a middle-class lifestyle, Livesay struggled from one writer-in-residence post to another. Her income in 1971 was only $4066.42, at a time when the average income for writers and editors was $8772.[49]

Bourdieu uses *avant-garde* in ways that are asymmetrical to the uses given to the term by other theorists of culture, such as Burger. Bourdieu situates the *avant-garde* in the restricted subfield of the field of cultural production. In his theoretical model, only the restricted field is autonomous; the large-scale subfield is dependent upon the market. Burger's *Theory of the Avant-Garde* is based on the assumption that the entire field of art, works of art, artistic producers, and institutions, are independent from everyday social reality. Burger defines the *avant-garde* as a specific, historically situated, artistic movement whose purpose it was to unite art and daily life once more. To Burger, the historical *avant-garde* is that European artistic generation of the 1920s which was led by André Breton, a revolutionary group that strove to destroy the institution of art. According to Burger, those writers and artists who subsequently adopt Breton's and Aragon's artistic strategies are *avant-garde* but not revolutionary; that is, they form subsequent artistic generations within the *avant-garde* movement.

I propose that we consider the possibility of the *avant-garde* in both of Bourdieu's fields of literary production, restricted (literary and *avant-garde*) and large-scale (popular). My suggestion is in line with Fowler's criticism of Bourdieu for "disparaging" the field of popular literature; "he has underestimated the capacity for work of artistic power to arise in the large-scale field," she writes (65). Furthermore, Fowler accuses Bourdieu of considering only the critical reception of *avant-garde* art and "the movement's unintended social consequences," to the neglect of a well rounded analysis of literary and artistic products and their producers (95). Such an approach would involve, Fowler believes, an investigation of the "subjective 'missions' or world visions" of *avant-garde* artists, an investigation which would bring Bourdieu's work closer to Burger's focus on the political goals of the historical *avant-garde* (95). Finally, Fowler characterizes Bourdieu's studies of art as "fatalistic materialism," and Burger's studies as an "idealis[ation] [of] avant-garde culture" (96). For instance, Bourdieu perceives only a grab for artistic distinction in the subversiveness of avant-garde art (Fowler 94), while Burger sees real political value in *avant-garde* art. By allowing for the possibility of innovation in popular literature, such as the antiformulaic modernist tendencies in Macbeth's work, and for the possibility of subversion in art, I believe that literary critics can achieve a broader, more realistic vision of the literary field in a specific historical moment and geographical location. For instance, Livesay's proletarian writing of the early thirties is excluded from the literary canon, while her imagist and low modernist poetry is included. A complete picture of the Canadian literary field during the Great Depression necessitates the inclusion of small leftist magazines, such as the *Peoples' Advocate, Masses*, and *New Frontier* where Livesay's communist writing was published.

In light of the differences in their position-takings within the political field, it may be surprising to note that Macbeth and Livesay cannot be located at opposite ends of the popular- literature/literary-writing continuum in the Canadian literary field. As I have suggested, Macbeth's writing is not purely popular; *Shackles* (1926) exhibits modernist tendencies, and *Volcano* (1963) is arguably an early Canadian example of *l'écriture au feminin*. Macbeth wrote many adventure romances, especially in the early years of her career, but much of her fiction was nonformulaic. Nor can Livesay be located entirely at the high art end of the continuum, because she refused to ignore partisan politics; she was a politically motivated modernist poet. At the same time, her low modernist poetry is the product of both her political radicalism and her dedication to literary writing, that is, to art. Furthermore, her preference for "a federation or guild of serious writers" over the CAA's supposedly commodified approach to literary production marks Livesay as a modernist (Letter to Editor of *Saturday Night* in UA 96-69 Box 2 File 25). However, the introduction of political concerns to art, a characteristic of low modernism such as Livesay's, complicates the popular-literature/ pure-art continuum by reducing the gap between didactic popular literature, such as Nellie McClung's novels, and modernist high art. If Livesay's socially critical poetry can be admitted to the ranks of literary writing, McClung's feminist polemic and Macbeth's modernist and feminist works deserve similar consideration.

Macbeth gave a great deal of thought to her position as a writer, her relationship to the reader, and her relationship to the publisher. She spoke publicly on these issues to various organizations such as the Women's Canadian Club, the Kiwanis Club, and the CAA. In an undated speech titled "Why is a Writer," Macbeth distinguishes between commercial and professional writers. Commercial writers, according to Macbeth, are hack writers of formula fiction, whereas professional writers are more concerned with form and structure. "We do not," she writes, "like the purely commercial writer, disregard a subject, or a style because it may not be popular; on the other hand, we try to construct our work in saleable form" (CACRCO Vol.2 File 4 P.2). Attention to form was a major preoccupation of modernist poets, but, to Macbeth, a poet was not a professional writer. In her view, as in Virginia Woolf's, the professional writer was someone who supported himself or herself from the proceeds of writing. "The novelist is the sole representative of the profession of letters today," Macbeth claims, and she counted herself among that group (2). According to Elliott and Wallace, Woolf wrote for the popular journals because she was "commit[ted] to an ethos of women's professionalism," but she also broke new ground in her novels, a requirement of modernism (73). As I argue in Chapter 4, some of Macbeth's fiction is radically feminist and modernist.

The material conditions of Macbeth's life dictated that she had to make money from her writing; however, she rejects both the devaluation of popular literature and the notion that her work is commercial. In a speech delivered to the Montreal Kiwanis Club, Macbeth declares that all novelists, including herself, are realists who report on life as they see it, and she bemoans the lack of high art in literature of the period:

Because we have industrialized Art, there are more books published now than ever

> before, and that in turn, means that there is less of Art and more of industry. In other words, too many neurotic and tommyrotic books reach the stalls. (CACRCO Vol.2 File 4 "What Writers Want")

This statement reads like a modernist manifesto which is about to launch into a condemnation of the commodification of literature. However, Macbeth simultaneously values the Romantic notion of literature as a mirror of society, and she demands that her listeners create a just society which could provide more inspirational models for the novelist, a demand which reveals her interpellation by the Victorian values of her day.

In the English-Canadian literary field, the popular-literature/literary-writing binary serves not only to hierarchize the work of journalists and formula fiction writers in relation to that of modernist poets and *avant-garde* experimenters, but also to demarcate lines in literary debates. An example of one portion of these debates appears in the July-August 1932 issue of *Masses*, where we find a confrontation between two leftist writers over the usefulness or uselessness of pure art to socialism. T. Richardson's article, "In Defense of Pure Art," which launches the discussion, uses all the binaries that typify the popular-literature/high-art dichotomy. Richardson claims that "Art is more clarified, more pure, than ever before," and urges socialist artists to eject propaganda from their work ("In Defense of Pure Art" n.p.). "Soap-box orators do not produce art," Richardson maintains (n.p.). The purity of art must not be sullied by content, a standard that prevails in critiques of didactic literature. In the same issue of *Masses*, E. Cecil-Smith contests Richardson's thesis by insisting that art is "the means of expression for society's ideas" (n.p.). To Cecil-Smith, the subject-matter of art takes precedence over form, and art is inevitably an ideological tool, regardless of which class controls the field of cultural production. "The revolutionary artist today is not the modernist who continues to express the ideology of the ruling class under capitalism," writes Cecil-Smith. "He is the artist, however poor he may be mechanically, who strives to express the ideas of the future ruling class - the working people" (n.p.). Although Cecil-Smith writes that the "The revolutionary must master technique," s/he does not define technique. Formal questions of style in art are clearly secondary to content for this writer, and the choice of 'technique' to describe a creative product reveals the writer's sympathy for the masculine worker's arena of technology.

The debate over pure art in the *Masses* of 1932 was part of an international discussion among artists and writers. Elliott and Wallace give the Bloomsbury art critic, Roger Fry, credit for "generat[ing] a two-tiered system involving imagery which was instinctive and disinterested as opposed to that which was social and symbolic" in his writing of the 1920s and 1930s (3). "Instinctive and disinterested" is to art for art's sake as "social and symbolic" is to the genre of socialist realism, which was promoted by the Soviet Comintern during the 1920s and 1930s. Livesay's socialist modernist poetry, which represents the best Canadian literature of this period, was developed from the struggle within more than one field; it was the result of complex negotiations that had to be undertaken by any writer who wanted her work to change the social and material structure of both the Canadian literary field and the country.

In Canada, the pure art end of the popular-literature/pure-art continuum intersects with modernists' opposition to nationalism and promotion of internationalism, a preoccupation that persisted to varying degrees during the three decades under discussion. Canadian modernism arose in social, industrial, and economic circumstances of innovation and expansion, as it did in Europe and the United States; however, the Canadian modernist scene was complicated by the search for a national identity, the development of which was expected to be propelled by a national literary canon.[50] As I explain in Chapter 4, debates in the Canadian literary field over nationalism versus internationalism revolve around two fundamental questions: What is Canadian Literature? or Is there a Canadian Literature?, and What are the standards of Canadian Literature? I argue that the popular-literature/literary-writing dichotomy mediates the Canadian literary debate over national literary standards versus universal standards of art. Modernists considered the idea of a national literary standard to be provincial, narrow, and intellectually unrigorous; according to them, such a relatively local perspective could reduce artistic literary standards to the level of popular literature, a feminized subfield in which masculinist modernists declined to participate. Debates, resistances, and alternative forms of cultural production challenge this basic condition of the cultural field, the popular-literature/pure-art continuum, and Canadian writers range along an intersecting continuum from nationalist to internationalist perspectives. In the second half of this chapter, I examine the feminist theories and the theories of nations and nationalisms which I consider relevant to my study of the English-Canadian literary field of 1920-1950.

B. FEMINIST THEORIES

Feminist Marxism

Feminist theorists clash with Marxists over the relative importance of class and gender as analytical categories. Socialists and Marxists view class as an over-riding factor which determines all areas of life and work in capitalist societies. As I have already suggested in my discussion of Bourdieu's tendency to favour class over other variables, I side with feminist theorists on this issue. Feminist sociologist Dorothy Smith contends that "the contradiction of gender is more fundamental in capitalism than is the contradiction of class."[51] In *The Conceptual Practices of Power: A Feminist Sociology of Knowledge*, Smith defines the contradiction of gender as the "bifurcation of consciousness" between the concrete or particular, and the abstract or conceptual (21). Smith's work grew out of her alienation from the discipline of sociology, an alienation that developed in reaction to sociology's suppression of the local and elevation of the abstract, and to sociology's insistence that its practitioners should censor their experiences of concrete "everyday/everynight" realities in the name of scientific objectivity (6). Smith's contention of the fundamental importance of gender is a recent event in feminist discourses on science and the economy, discourses that have a genealogy.

The public debate which took place in the late 1970s between three feminist Marxists, Christine Delphy on the one hand, and Michèle Barrett and Mary McIntosh on the other, is an illuminating incident in this genealogy. I have found that an understanding of this earlier debate helps to clarify arguments over the merits of the concept of class and its relation to gender. Like Smith, Delphy critiques her discipline, sociology, for its neglect of gender; whereas Smith criticized sociology's neglect of women's positions in relation to conceptual modes of production, Delphy criticized its neglect of women's positions in relation to "the system of industrial wage-labour" (Delphy 38). In her collection of essays *Close to Home: A materialist analysis of women's oppression* (1984),[52] Delphy delineates "marriage as a class position for women" and she bases her statement on the unremunerated domestic labour of married women in all classes (38). Delphy argues that a class based on the patriarchal oppression of women "override[s] commonality of industrial [social] class" within the family unit (39). When Delphy was critiquing sociology in the 1970s, the work done by unremunerated married women was excluded by economists from calculations of the Gross Domestic Product and ignored by most census compilers and social-science researchers, who listed a married woman's class according to her husband's occupation and income.[53] In order to analyze the implicit double standard in this methodology, Delphy separates the family or patriarchal mode of production, in which the wife's labour is appropriated by the husband, from the capitalist mode of production, in which the worker's labour is exploited by the owner (39). She performs this analytical separation because she perceives the unemployed married woman's "labour relationship [as] part of a specific mode of production, different from and parallel to the wage-labour mode" (38). Furthermore, Delphy takes the position that patriarchy predates and subsumes capitalism. Barrett and McIntosh, on the other hand, see women as part of those classes which derive from the capitalist economic system, that is, proletarian and bourgeois classes.[54] Following classical Marxism, Barrett and McIntosh subsume the patriarchal mode of production within the capitalist or industrial mode of production. They criticize Delphy for ignoring the masculine "half of the family production," for neglecting to consider the relation between ideology and economics, and for universalizing from one specific culture and class, the French farming family (4,2,6).

Delphy's conceptualization of class is a feminist Marxist sociologist's attempt to intervene in the Marxist and sociological discourses, both of which elide the oppression of women in their analytical methodologies. Stevi Jackson has analyzed Delphy's development and use of patriarchal class as a concept separate from capitalist classes. In relation to the left's privileging of the capitalist class struggle over all other struggles against inequity, Jackson writes, "To see women as a class means accepting that their oppression is as serious as that of the male proletariat, and this disrupts the usual ordering of priorities among both left activists and Marxist theorists" (100). Delphy's critique of the discipline of sociology consists of the following two main points: first, sociologists ignore inequities within the family by "treating the family as an undifferentiated unit"; second, defining class by a person's occupation "excludes the majority of the population - those past retirement age, women, children and other dependents - who are not 'holders' of class positions in their own right" (104, 109). The suggestion by feminist sociologist Joan Acker, among many others, that women who are not employed outside the home be placed within the occupation of housework partially answers Delphy's latter objection. As far as the problem of treating the family as an undifferentiated unit, Delphy herself falls into this trap in a different way. If we accept her concept of gender as a class within the domestic mode of production, we must consider one type of home at one point in time, in one culture, that is, the Western nuclear or extended family with children; Delphy's critique of sociology is conducted through her analysis of the traditional farm family in France during the 1970s. Her culturally specific definition of the home and the domestic mode of production includes women and men of all ages, but it ignores life-span and cultural differences. For instance, the adult Western woman or man may live alone and work or be unemployed; in this case, they are classed according to their own occupational categories, not that of the male head of the household. Delphy does not address the question of time, but according to Jackson, she answers the question of the single woman by asserting that all women, regardless of age or marital relationship, are materially affected by the social assumption that they will marry.

Following Delphy, feminist sociologist Sylvia Walby has proposed an acceptable compromise to this debate over class and gender. Although Walby agrees that husbands and wives form separate classes within the traditional patriarchal home, she contests the concept of men and women forming separate classes throughout societies; rather, she considers men and women as "status groups" (Jackson 112). I follow Walby's conceptualization because Delphy's model of patriarchal class does not account for the lack of a domestic mode of production in the homes of either single wage-earners who have no children, or single parents. However, Delphy's point that the patriarchal mode of production precedes the capitalist mode of production both historically and in terms of power is an important factor in my analysis.

Thus far I have used patriarchy as an umbrella term for the oppression of women; however, feminists disagree about the acceptability of patriarchy as an analytical term. As we shall see, Joan Acker's criticism of radical feminists' use of patriarchy resembles the objections made to standpoint theory:

> Patriarchy, in radical feminist versions, was seen as a universal, trans-historical and trans-cultural phenomenon; women were everywhere oppressed by men in more or less the same ways. Such notions of patriarchy tended toward a biological essentialism that provided no basis for theorizing the vast historical and contemporary variations in women's situations. (234)

The charge of essentialism derives from the claim that classical patriarchy or the rule of the father, a historically specific example of patriarchy which existed in ancient civilizations, cannot represent all forms of the oppression of women. The fear is that universalization of a form of patriarchy which is based on patrimony reifies gender as a natural result of biological sexual difference and erases the construction of gender by social processes.

In "Theorising Patriarchy," Sylvia Walby offers a nuanced model of patriarchy which, I believe, takes into account historical, racial, and cultural differences. She defines patriarchy as "a system of social structures, and practices in which men dominate, oppress and exploit women," and she differentiates between public and private forms of patriarchy. Private patriarchy operates in the family and interpersonal relationships, and involves the restriction of women to the home; public patriarchy "takes place more collectively than individually" and is subdivided into market-economy and state-controlled forms of patriarchy (228). In Walby's model of patriarchy, six patriarchal structures intersect, exhibiting "different levels of importance in the subordination of women" (229). The six structures are: the patriarchal mode of production (domestic mode of production);

male violence; and patriarchal relations in the workforce, in the state, in sexuality, and in cultural institutions such as religion, the media, and education (214, 220, 229). Walby does not hierarchize these forms of patriarchy in terms of importance, and she sees them as historically and geographically variable.

Another approach to patriarchy is proposed by Malcolm Waters in "Patriarchy and Viriarchy: An Exploration and Reconstruction of Concepts of Masculine Domination." Waters introduces the term "masculine gender systems" (MGS) to indicate male-dominated relations between men and women. He defines patriarchy as classical patriarchy, a system in which the most senior man has control over all other men in his kinship line, as well as over all women, children, slaves and property. Waters defines viriarchy as a system of male domination in which all adult males control women, children and property, regardless of kinship relations. As Waters suggests, viriarchy is a useful term for late capitalist forms of patriarchy.

Joan Acker criticizes Waters and Walby for their use of dual system theories which, according to Acker, merely reproduce the dualisms inherent in all masculinist discourse. Acker believes that gender is a more relational and pervasive concept than patriarchy. However, she does note two faults with the replacement of patriarchy by gender: as a concept, gender is less politically powerful and it can more easily be co-opted by hegemonic discourses. In my view, the concept of gender, and its construction, ideology, operation, and intersection with race, class, and sexual orientation, is central to both patriarchy and feminist theories; that is, gender and patriarchy function in a fundamental and mutual relationship. The critique of patriarchy and masculinism and the study of gender are major functions of feminism. Many feminists, including myself, use masculinism interchangeably with patriarchy, understood as a late capitalist masculinist gender system in which the operating principle is the domination and exploitation of women.[55]

Materialist Feminism

Materialism is an important aspect of this project, and I want to take a moment to examine terms relevant to its theoretical model. To my mind, the modern negative connection of materialist with materialistic or "selfish worldliness" gives cause for consideration before adopting any critical term containing the word material (Williams 199). In his useful etymology of cultural terms, *Keywords*, Williams states that the root word, materia (L), refers not only to the building material of wood, but also to domestic life. His work shows that the masculinist mind/body dichotomy, which philosophers assign to Descartes, is preceded chronologically by binaries of matter versus form, matter versus spirit, and matter versus ideas. According to Williams, these primary binaries have held a class bias since the fourteenth century. Matter and material concerns were relegated to the lower classes, the producing classes, in a historical period when people's material needs were produced entirely in the domestic sphere.

The term feminist materialism, which is based on historical materialism, indirectly highlights Marx's neglect of gender; however, Rosemary Hennessy uses materialist feminist to describe Marxist feminists such as Michèle Barrett and Christine Delphy, and Marxist feminist Teresa Ebert is a self-named materialist feminist. The difference between materialist feminism and feminist materialism, in my view, lies in the emphasis of one theoretical model over the other: feminism or historical materialism. Hennessy defines materialist feminism as a feminism which "locates its theoretical object and its frame of inquiry in history and understands its project as revolutionary praxis always subject to revision from the disruptive force of its own historicity" (13). Ebert's definition of materialist feminism is clearer: "Broadly, materialist feminism is a political practice aimed at social transformation of dominant institutions that, as a totality, distribute economic resources and cultural power asymmetrically according to gender" ("Ludic Feminism..." 5). Both Hennessy's and Ebert's definitions suggest that oppositional consciousness and political activism are central to materialist feminism; as I claim in the next section, this aspect of materialist feminism closely resembles feminist standpoint theory.

Both Ebert and Hennessy use historical materialism to serve the aims of feminism.

In their work, both historical materialism and feminism are constructed as methods to achieve social change. Furthermore, the term *materialist* feminism serves to distinguish its concern with history, labour, the economy, and power structures from postmodern and poststructuralist feminist theories which focus on the body, discourse, and power. Ebert relegates postmodern discursive theories of the body and power to "post-ality," and, like Hennessy and Sandra Harding, she calls for a feminist theory that explains the oppression of women through historical processes.[56] In Ebert's view, the micropolitics of the personal and of the daily must be contextualized in light of the macropolitics of national and international power structures; hers is a systemic analysis. My use of the term materialist feminism is intended to indicate the primacy of feminism over materialism in my analysis. Other feminist writers reverse the order of materialism and feminism. Wallace uses the term feminist cultural materialism partly to differentiate her work from materialists of other disciplines.[57] By calling herself a feminist cultural materialist, Wallace situates herself in a multidisciplinary setting, a move which is appropriate to hers and Elliott's work on women writers and artists.

My privileging of feminism over materialism is an implicit critique of historical materialist theorists' tendency to ignore the issue of gender. For instance, in his discussion of the etymology of materialism, Williams's mention of the domestic side of materia is an oblique reference to the factor of gender. He states that "historical materialism offers explanations of the causes of...selfish preoccupation with goods and money and...describes social and historical ways of overcoming it and establishing co-operation and mutuality" (200). Thus, in Williams's argument, class is central, and the communist and socialist aspects of the historical materialist methodology are its saving grace; in his view, historical materialism counters accusations of crass self-interest from the opposition. Assumptions of the feminization of the material and negative connotations surrounding the feminine lead Marx's opponents to deride any theory which focuses on the material reality of social production and reproduction. However, this antifeminist bias also underlies Williams's Marxist argument. My reversal of the term feminist materialism is based both on my objections to the systemic masculinism within the theoretical fields that are relevant to this project, and on my commitment to feminist praxis, that is, to the advocacy of social change based on a theory of gender.

Standpoint Theory

> *If we begin from the world as we actually experience it, it is at least possible to see that we are indeed located and that what we know of the other is conditional upon that location....It is the place from which inquiry begins.* (Smith 25)

Standpoint theory, a relatively recent feminist theory which has had widespread currency in American feminisms, especially among feminist social scientists, is based on the material life experiences of white women in particular socio-economic circumstances and at a specific historical moment. Standpoint theory has provided the basis for liberal feminists' work in equity programs and for feminist activists' organization of rape crisis centres and battered women's shelters. The second-wave feminists who initiated standpoint theory were primarily white, middle-class, heterosexual women; their standpoint was universalized to women of all races, ethnicities, classes, and sexual orientations. In recent decades, women of colour, lesbian women, women of nondominant ethnicities, and working-class women have made feminist standpoint theory inclusive of their "other" experiences.

Some feminists, such as Rosemary Hennessey, reject standpoint theory, while others, such as Harding, Smith, and Nancy Hartsock, utilize a modified standpoint theory that is refined for inclusivity. To date, following Evelyn Fox-Keller's critique of science and the myth of objectivity, I have resisted the claim to any possibility for objectivity on the part of a human subject; however, Harding's consideration of strong objectivity in feminist standpoint theory is convincing. In "Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What is 'Strong Objectivity?'," Harding explains this concept as a combination of self-reflexivity with a nonempiricist, feminist form of objectivity. Basing her claims on Smith's use of Hegelian philosophy, Harding argues that the dominant group of any society is less able to understand the dominant-dominated relationship than is the dominated group. She writes:

> The starting point of standpoint theory - and its claim that is most often misread -

> is that in societies stratified by race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality, or some other such politics shaping the very structure of a society, the*activities* of those at the top both organize and set limits on what persons who perform such activities can understand about themselves and the world around them. (442)

In masculinist social systems, women are rarely "at the top"; rather, women and their work are marginalized and exploited to varying degrees, contingent on race, class, sexual identity, age, and ethnicity. Furthermore, as Bourdieu contends, writers are dominated within their privileged classes. Feminist literary theorists, whose thought is also contingent on various factors in their field, are able to bring "fresh and more critical questions" to a project which analyzes the relationship between women writers and masculinism (Harding 451).

A position that starts from standpoint theory can be taken by both men and women who pay attention to marginalized groups, study such groups, and educate themselves on the points-of-view, problems, and aspirations of the members of the group in question. It seems doubtful that, in practice, self-education and political commitment can entirely modify the effects of a habitus formation which occurs under very different circumstances; self-reflexivity on the part of the intellectual engaged in such activities may be the most that we can expect. For example, although Livesay was white and middle-class, she allied herself across racial and class lines with the standpoints of the poor and victims of social injustice. These alliances affected the trajectory of her writing career, even though such alliances are never complete in practice. Livesay worked to understand the standpoint of the working class, but she was not a member of the working class; her radical politics were subversive of dominant political forces, but she possessed cultural capital that workers of either sex did not. The economic situation of a lower-middle-class writer, however mediated by membership in the dominated fraction of the dominant class, is considerably better than that of an unemployed worker. Livesay remained a product of the Canadian middle classes, and she modified her political activity accordingly in the late 1930s.

An important contradiction that is inherent within feminist standpoint theory also operates in my critique of the Canadian literary field: feminists critique both masculinity and femininity, but we also protest the devaluation of the feminine, as I have done in the context of the popular-literature/pure-art continuum. This contradiction may well be viewed as a defensive measure; it is a double-edged strategy, one which attempts to change the power imbalance within masculinist cultures by deploying resistance from two vantage points. Contradictory strategies such as this one mimic social change policies which simultaneously address an inequity with more than one remedy. Since the devaluation of the feminine and the sexual division of labour are products of masculinist systems of power, many strategies for dealing with such social problems will be merely defensive until and if the hegemonic system they characterize is overthrown. In this dissertation, I deal with the devaluation of the feminine in Chapters 4 and 5, and with the critique of masculinity and femininity throughout.

Feminists disagree over standpoint theory's efficacy for research. Hennessy argues that standpoint theory reifies gender as a category based on biological or sexual difference, but this is not necessarily the case. The socially constructed category 'woman' can contain both male and female bodies, as in the case of trans-sexuals; the same principle applies to the socially constructed category of 'man'. Hennessy also sees standpoint theory's stated principle of starting from women's lives as universalistic. However, Marxist Ann Ferguson believes that a certain amount of universalism and transhistoricalism characterize women's social positions. In "The Intersection of Race, Gender, and Class in the United States Today," Ferguson points out that both different roles for men and women, and the "gender deference principle" operate in all masculinist systems (54). According to Ferguson, the gender deference principle derives from the nurturing role assigned to women and amounts to "a general social tendency to assume that women should defer to the male peers in their social context" (54). These two features provide potential areas of unity among women across class, race, and ethnicity. However, Ferguson warns that:

> the concept of genders as racially specified and racial identities as gender specified requires us to avoid assuming *either* that women in a racist society have nothing

> in common because of racism *or* that we have everything in common in a sexist society because of sexism. Rather, to say personal identities involve racial genders is to say that there are economic, political, and cultural practices through which race identities and gender identities get defined. (54)

The combination of standpoint theory with articulation, especially Stuart Hall's definition of articulation as unity in difference, can go far toward remedying the tendency towards universalism in standpoint theory. In this project, I adopt Hennessy's concept of articulation, derived from the work of Althusser, and I modify it with Hall's and Jennifer Slack's cultural studies approach to articulation. The concept of articulation is useful for understanding the intersections of gender, race, class, and ethnicity with issues such as nationalism and internationalism. As Hennessy explains articulation, each factor (class, gender, race, sexuality, age etc.) relates to another factor and to an issue or historical moment in a flexible, contingent, constantly changing, material relationship. Both Hennessy's articulation and Harding's strong objectivity foreground the necessity to situate any analysis within history; furthermore, the concept of "an articulated system of positions" facilitates the application of Bourdieu's concept of the habitus (Hennessy 96). Both the agency and the determinacy of a subject-position can be illustrated by an examination of the theoretical and material "mechanisms that affect the historical availability of particular positions to some subjects and not others as well as movements across and between them" (Hennessy 74). For example, Livesay's transitions from communism to social democracy and from proletarian writing to low modernism occurred during a specific historical moment, the Great Depression, when other middle-class writers made similar choices. Moreover, her various position-takings were more readily adopted by an educated, middle-class Canadian; that is, her disposition or positionality (her interpellated position) influenced her position-takings, her diversions from that interpellation.

Slack discusses articulation within a broader framework than does Hennessy. When she explains that context is not a medium within which a practice develops, Slack is emphasizing the *relation* between context and practice, a relation that Bourdieu is also concerned to understand. "Rather," she writes, "*identities, practices, and effects generally, constitute the very context within which they are practices, identities or effects* (emphasis in original 125). In terms of the Canadian literary field, I understand this view of articulation to mean that there is a close articulation not only between field and agent, but also between the social processes and institutions that influence both field and agent; these articulations occur in addition to, or concurrently with, the articulations of ethnicity, race, class, gender, and sexual orientation as they affect each agent within each field.

Hall and Slack engage with the concept of articulation in a larger arena than does Hennessy because their methodology is politically motivated. Slack writes that "Hall's commitment to the strategic feature of articulation has foregrounded cultural studies' interventionist commitments" (121). Hall criticizes poststructuralism and discourse theory for their tendencies to both apoliticism and a sense of hopelessness in relation to social change; in this criticism he resembles Ebert and Shiach. A founder of the Birmingham Centre for Cultural Studies in the U.K., Hall defines cultural studies as the study of "cultural politics" and cultural politics as "the relationship between culture (meaning signifying practices) and power" (Chen 395). Cultural studies "is not a universal language," he says in an interview, "[but] it is a language in which the tensions between similarity and difference can be negotiated, by people in different positions" (Chen 408). I draw on Hall's view of "articulation as unity in difference," an approach he takes as a means of challenging postmodernist theories which he believes fetishize difference and reduce all political struggles to discursive practices (Slack 120, 121). Hall's concept of articulation as unity in difference is the corollary of the formulation which I use in my study of Livesay and Macbeth: differences within similarities. As women, Livesay and Macbeth share a systemic subordination, yet they exhibit different performances of gender. Moreover, as English-speaking Caucasians, they are more privileged than nonCaucasian Canadians, yet each one responds differently to issues of race. Their gender positions articulate with their racial positions, producing variations within relations of power. The concept of articulation as unity in difference also figures in my analysis of modernist literary generations. In Chapter 4, I discuss three generations of Canadian literary modernists, all of whom lay claim to the modernist movement at the same time as they differentiate themselves through, for example, debates over their differing perceptions of the appropriate form and content for modernist poetry.

C. THEORIES of NATIONS and NATIONALISMS

Feminist theorists of the nation discuss the nation and nationalism as gendered concepts; Jean Bethke Elshtain believes that 'nation state' is itself a gendered binary. Most male theorists of the nation neglect sex/gender differences.[58] In her introduction to *Feminist Nationalism*, Lois West suggests that if feminist theorists of the nation did not use standpoint theory to discuss women's roles in nationalism and the gendered nature of nationalism, these aspects of the subject would not be addressed (xiv). West develops a concept for discussing nationalism, "gendered cultural relativism," which resembles standpoint theory in that it "puts women at the center of knowledge" (1992 563). She writes:

> By beginning with the way *women* define feminism and nationalism within their cultural context (gendered cultural relativism), feminist nationalism is born in varying historically specific cultures. The tenets or aspects that are shared cross-culturally should be regarded within a framework of moral universalism, a way of moving toward a more universal feminist discourse but realizing that it may always be circumscribed by cultural differences. (1997 xv)

Two factors that affect women cross-culturally, according to West, are the role of women as "primary caretakers," and women's "economic and political marginaliz[ation]" (1997 xiv). On this point, West's work resembles Ferguson's; both theorists offer concrete examples of the way in which Hall's unity in difference could operate within feminist praxis.

The topic of the nation and nationalism is complicated by lack of uniformity in definitions of the terms state and nation. Historian Michael Ignatieff uses nation as an adjective modifying state.[59] Other theorists and historians of the nation use the hyphenated form, nation-state, a usage which suggests equality between terms, that is, ethnic homogeneity.[60] Nira Yuval-Davis and Floya Anthias warn against equating the nation with the state. They write:

> The tendency in much of the literature on the state to identify it with `the nation' is linked to the historical fact that nationalism in the West has been a central force in the development of the nation-state. The ensuing conflation of the boundary of the state with that of the nation fails to recognise that state processes can be more delimited than national processes. (3)

In western states, women began to vote later and on unequal terms with male voters. Minorities of both sexes, such as Catholics of seventeenth-century England and Africans of the Apartheid era in South Africa, were excluded by law from some state processes. Moreover, minority nations, such as the First Nations of both Canada and the United States, Kurds, and Palestinians, live in more than one state. In addition to institutionalized state oppression, the women of these minorities also deal with masculinist oppression within their ethnic, racial, or religious groups. Although the nation and the state may be separate entities in specific instances, masculinist systems of control are common to both.

While Yuval-Davis and Anthias discuss the development of Western democracy from nationalism, E.J. Hobsbawm distinguishes between nationalism and revolution as two distinct driving forces in the development of the nation state. In the French revolution, he explains, "the central concept was the sovereign citizen-people = state, which, in relation to the remainder of the human race, constituted a `nation'" (Hobsbawm 22). The French republican concept is today the basis of civic nationalism. On the other hand, nationalists of the late eighteenth century saw the state as an inevitable by-product of the activity of a homogeneous ethnic nation, a principle which is now called ethnic nationalism. Canadian Confederation, an agreement between two nations and several ethnic groups which shared the territory of four provinces, did not require a revolution. Neither was it instigated by a unified nationalist movement; in fact, some provinces were nationalistic towards their own regions and were thus reluctant to join Confederation. Hobsbawm explains that homogeneous ethnicity is unnecessary to patriotism in the nation-state; both he and Ernest Gellner point out that nationalism often follows the organization of a state and the development of patriotism to that state.

Two kinds of nationalism, civic and ethnic, recur in the discourse on nations and nationalisms. Civic nationalism, according to Ignatieff, originated in Britain and is found in Western democracies such as Canada. "[Civic nationalism] envisages the nation as a community of equal, rights-bearing citizens," he writes, "united in patriotic attachment to a shared set of political practices and values" (3-4). Ignatieff privileges civic nationalism above ethnic nationalism, which he characterizes as violent, primitive, parochial, and inevitably leading to tyranny and discrimination. In this sense, his thought derives from the French and American republican traditions, which foreground civic nationalism. To Ignatieff, ethnic nationalism is a "temptation" to be avoided, a temptation that leads toward authoritarianism and against democracy (5). He presents western democracy as an ideal when, in fact, "the British democratic and legal tradition" is founded on systemic discrimination on the basis of class and sex (Ignatieff 5). The struggles for universal male suffrage in Britain and for female suffrage in all Western democracies were protracted and often violent.

Ignatieff bases his theories on his study of nationalisms in Eastern Europe, Northern Ireland, and Quebec during 1991 and 1992. Ignatieff's elitist attitude to ethnic nationalism is based on the masculinist dichotomy between reason and passion, a dichotomy which leads him to demote the emotion of ethnic nationalisms to the level of "kitsch" and to assume that civic nationalism is advanced and superior because it is intellectual (6). For example, Ignatieff claims that ethnic nationalists are "supremely sentimental" and incapable of "conciliating their disagreements by democratic discussion" (6).[61] The reason-passion binary also appears in Hobsbawm's writing; he claims to be objective about nationalisms because he is not a nationalist. "[N]o serious historian of nations and nationalism can be a committed political nationalist," he writes, and he urges nationalists such as Zionists, Fenians or Orangemen to "leave his or her convictions behind when entering the library or the study" (12, 13). In fact, according to Harding's concept of strong objectivity, a nationalist can be more `objective' about nationalisms than a non-nationalist like Hobsbawm, whose work lacks self-reflexivity with regard to the biases he brings into his own study.

Ignatieff and Hobsbawm follow the liberal humanist tradition of Julien Benda and Pierre E. Trudeau, a tradition that preserves the hegemony of masculinism by, among other strategies, privileging masculinity over femininity. British historian Tom Nairn is an exception to the general rule of antinationalism among historians of nationalisms. Although Nairn is not a feminist and does not address the factor of gender, he analyzes the development of antinationalism in Western intellectual circles. In "Demonising Nationalism," Nairn suggests that the widespread revulsion toward the "genetic imperialism" of Nazi Germany during the 1930s is a major factor in the current trend of antinationalism (4). "Since the largest, most important *ethnos* in Europe had gone mad in that particular way," he writes, "the ethnic as such must remain forever suspect" (4). Civic nationalists reasonably reject the fascist eugenics of Nazi Germany. However, antifascism is only one component of antinationalism; antifeminism and the feminization of ethnic nationalism are the others.

Feminist theorists have begun to tackle the nexuses of nationhood, nationalism, capitalism, masculinism and sex/gender, partly because women of all nation states are implicated in nationalist movements and ideology. In *Woman-Nation-State*, Yuval-Davis and Anthias provide a very useful list of "ways in which women have tended to participate in ethnic and national processes and in relation to state practices" (7). According to their list, women's participation includes the reproduction of nationalist citizens both physically through giving birth and culturally through teaching the nation's music, folktales, and language to children; through the demarcation of nations by means of endogamous marriage; and through the symbolism of nations. For example, Canada and Britain are both represented as female figures, Miss Canada and Britannia.

Patriarchy's successful development of an ideology which affects all areas of social and cultural production is evident in the gendering of nationalist representations. Anne McClintock claims that all nationalisms are gendered; she explains that the naturalization of "social difference" and "hierarchies within the nation" were achieved in the nineteenth century through the ideological use of the metaphor of the nation as family (357-358). In other words, class and masculinism articulate with nationalisms in a mutually beneficial system of power. In the nineteenth-century Canadian literary field, Agnes Machar and Charles Mair are only two of the many writers who use the metaphor of the nation as family. Machar declares, "Patriotism...is only public spirit widened from the family to the country, just as cosmopolitanism is the same public spirit widened from the country to the world," and Mair describes Canada as "A filial nation, strong and free -/ Great Britain's child to manhood grown" (Machar 716; Mair qtd in Wallace 71). In Mair's poem, dedicated to William Foster, a fellow founder of the nationalist group Canada First, the family consists of a masculine child nation and a feminine mother country. Other writers use fatherland for the head of the national family.[42] The metaphor of the nation as family is deployed to justify national and international class systems through a favourable comparison to the inequities within the micro model of the family. Moreover, the ideology of gender, so important to patriarchy, serves nationalism by naturalizing the distinction between feminine and masculine ways of participating in nationalist activities.

The symbol of the nation as a family obscures the lack of material power accorded either to women or to the domestic sphere in masculinist social systems. In 1917, the federal vote was granted *only* to the few Canadian women who were serving in WW1, most of whom served in the gendered occupation of nursing, and to Canadian women who were related to male members of the armed forces (Prentice 234). This Canadian example of discrimination on the basis of sex is not unusual in Western history. McClintock states that the Napoleonic Code legalized the national and political dependence of women on husbands and fathers. "For women," she writes, "citizenship in the nation was mediated by the marriage relation within the family...the wife's nationality should follow her husband's" (358). In Chapter 3, I outline the way that Madge Macbeth's life follows this pattern; she was born American but adopted her Canadian husband's nationality after their marriage. Furthermore, Macbeth participates in imperialist and nationalist discourses of motherhood and race through her middle-class concern over the health and reproductive capacity of working-class, white, Anglo-Saxon, Canadian women. On the other hand, Macbeth's nationalist activism on behalf of Canadian writers, for example in the copyright wars, creates an example and a space for female writers in the field of Canadian Literature. Her self-positioning in relation to English Canadian nationalism of 1920-1950 grows out of the material and ideological circumstances faced by a white, upper-middle-class, immigrant widow and mother.

In "Sovereignty, Identity, Sacrifice," Elshtain traces the history of the construction of the nation as feminine and the state as masculine, a construction that she discerns in Western discourse. "The child's will-to-sacrifice [in war]," she writes, "flows from embodied ties to both parents that project outward into a more generalised relationship to a feminised motherland, a masculinized sovereign state" (403). Masculinism serves nationalisms through the regulation of women's reproduction of culture and people, the symbolic feminization of the nation, and the masculinization of heroism. The majority of soldiers are drawn from the under classes and their willingness to enlist derives not only from their positioning as protectors of the feminine homeland, a role that is constructed by masculinist ideology, but also from their disadvantaged position in a capitalist economic system. In his article, "The 1930s," Kenneth McNaught states that "many of the enlistments for the first Canadian Division [WWII] were the products of relief camps and work projects for the unemployed who brought with them a feeling of resignation rather than patriotic enthusiasm" (273).

During the majority of war conflicts, we find a particular conjuncture of masculinism, capitalism, and nationalisms, a conjuncture which exploits systems of oppression already in place, such as those based on race, class and gender, in order to attain victory over the perceived enemy. First, the widespread rape of women during war is a graphic example of the collusion of racism, masculinism, and nationalism. Mass rapes of women by the men of invading forces took place in Nanking in 1937, in Italy in 1943, in Vietnam in the mid-1960s, in Bangladesh in 1971, and more recently, in Bosnia between 1993 and 1995 (Khushalani 1). In their introduction to *Ethnicity, Gender and the Subversion of Nationalism*, Wilson and Frederiksen point out that "Systematic rape has been used throughout history as a deliberate strategy to defile and subjugate particular peoples, as Stolcke reminds us in the case of Latin America, and which we continue to witness whether in Vietnam or former Yugoslavia" (3). In both international and national conflicts in which ethnicity is of primary concern, discourses of racism and eugenics intersect in a perverse justification of rape as a weapon of war in the following way: militia members and soldiers destroy an ethnic group by polluting, or engineering, its gene pool. Through rape, women's biological reproductive role is exploited by the enemy as a means to a particular end, the downfall of the nationalist entity. "Where concepts of heredity and purity of blood underpin identities," write Wilson and Frederiksen, "'concerns about "racial contamination" may stir patriarchal fears about women's sexuality' [Brah 1993]. In such societies, rape is no longer an individual criminal act but becomes a crime against an entire people" (3). In *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*, Susan Brownmiller explains that, in the 1930s, Japanese and German military forces deliberately sanctioned rape both "as a weapon of terror" and as a means of extending their 'master races' (53). Moreover, Russians raped German women in retaliation when they entered Berlin late in WWII.

Brownmiller also points out that silence surrounded the rape atrocities of both world wars. Through their deconstruction of the hyperbole that characterized Allied war propaganda, Yale University scholars had a central role in the post-WWI denial of mass rapes by Germans. Furthermore, the Western media colluded with anticommunist ideology and acted in a racist manner by refusing to report the rapes of 20,000 Chinese women by the Japanese invaders of Nanking in December 1937; although the invasion of Nanking was widely reported, news items concentrated on property damage and deaths. The silence of both academe and the media on the incidence of rape in Nanking mimics the silence of the first three Geneva Conventions (1864, 1906, 1929). Before the Geneva Convention of 1949, rape was not considered to be a war crime and was not even mentioned in these early international treaties. The massive numbers of rapes and confinements for the purpose of prostitution that occurred during WWII led to an explicit prohibition of "rape, enforced prostitution, or any form of indecent assault" in Article 27 of the 1949 Geneva Convention (Khushalani 42). In Article 3(c) of the same document, rape is included under the phrase "outrages upon personal dignity, in particular humiliating and degrading treatment" (40).

Although silence on the subject of rape was the norm, when rape was mentioned in public discourse before 1949, the context was often that of ethnic nationalism. Russian journalist Ilya Ehrenburg reported on the German invaders' rape of Russian women with these words: "They are polluting our houses. They are violating and infecting our women" (Brownmiller 65). The bonds of masculinism and of homosociality underlie Ehrenburg's statement, in which he assumes that women are the property of men; in his view, the rape of Russian women by German men is a crime against Russian men, against the Russian nation. As Brownmiller asserts, "The act that is played out upon her [the rape victim] is a message passed between men - vivid proof of victory for one and loss and defeat for the other" (38).[63] Furthermore, masculinism is central to the fascist ideology which Ehrenburg reviles in his writing; for example, Hitler represented the German masses as feminine and himself as a psychic rapist who could conquer the feminine crowd through the power of his charismatic and domineering masculine personality (Brownmiller 49).

Second, the co-operative articulation of class, masculinism, and capitalism is advantageous to a capitalist economy, during both peacetime and wartime. In "Sexism, racism and Canadian nationalism," Roxana Ng discusses the history of "ethnic-group formation and gender relations in terms of the development of capitalism in Canada" (203). For instance, most female immigrants to Canada have been domestics and child-care workers; similarly, in the 1880s, Chinese men, who were not allowed to sponsor the immigration of their wives, were largely employed in hard labour on the construction of a transnational railway line. The Canadian ruling class of the period benefited from racist immigration laws and gendered, racialized labour; their goal was the development of a homogeneous, white, masculinist, noncommunist nation. Furthermore, capitalism cooperates with masculinism for access to a reserve army of cheap labour made up of those women who seek casual or part-time work in order to devote their primary hours to household management and motherhood, those women who cannot find full time work, and those women who have few marketable skills. During wartime the reserve army of female labour, drawn mainly from the working and lower middle classes, is encouraged to seek full time employment through the provision of public daycare systems, which are dismantled when conflict ends.[64] Much of the war work performed by women is masculine work, and when hostilities end, patriarchal ideology demands that these same women be laid off or pressured to resign to make room for unemployed male veterans. Capitalism benefits from this cooperative power relationship by gaining access both to a reserve army of cheap female labour and to opportunities for increased profits in the munitions industry. Finally, masculinism benefits from its collusion with capitalism and nationalisms by entrenching its control of the field of power. As Walby comments, "Women are excluded from access to state resources and power as part of a patriarchal system" (224). Nationalisms, masculinism, and capitalism meet in a mutually beneficial intersection of power structures.

The entire literary field rests on a foundation of masculinist assumptions about who deserves power and who does not, about which activities are powerful and which are powerless. Masculinist assumptions both emanate from and support the field of power, which consists of the subfields of economics, politics, science and technology, and religion, all of which are informed by patriarchy. The masculinist power base that is common to the nation, the field of literary production, and the popular-literature/literary-writing binary is a function of the systemic presence of patriarchal ideology. The devaluation of the feminine, the feminization of certain genres, the masculinization of others, the antifemininity of antinationalism: these factors constitute some of the masculinist grids in the literary field, grids which must be warily negotiated by any female or feminist writer who enters that hallowed precinct. In the following chapters, I examine the ways in which masculinism marginalizes, excludes, and/or devalues the work of Livesay and Macbeth, and the ways in which each of them negotiates systemic barriers in the Canadian literary field of 1920-1950. In the next chapter, I develop the feminist discussion of Canadian nationalism (1920-1950) that I have begun here, and I examine the relations of power between the Canadian establishment and the literary nationalists of 1920-1950. Also in Chapter 3, I analyze the participation of Canadian literary women in imperialist and nationalist discourses operating in Canada.

Chapter 3

Nationalism and the Canadian Field of Cultural Production

> *"Let the note of patriotism be sounded often. It will tend to create high ideals, good will and national harmony." (Manitoba Free Press* qtd in Edmonds 27)

Periods of high nationalist feelings have come and gone throughout Canadian history. The period between the two World Wars was a period of high nationalism in Canada but it certainly was not the first or the last. Earlier periods of nationalist fervour occurred in the nineteenth century, after the War of 1812, and after Confederation. The latter period of nationalism produced the Canada First movement (1868-1874), a short-lived but influential English-Canadian imperialist and nationalist group located in Ontario. According to W. Stewart Wallace, Canada First's platform, which included a demand for Dominion control over immigration, tariffs, and the military, was adopted by both the Conservative and Liberal Parties after the demise of this nationalist group (59). Kate Seymour MacLean, a teacher who is described as being "enthusiastic about the ideals of the Canada First movement," fulfills the nationalist woman's role of socializer of the next generation through her criticism of school texts (Henry Morgan in Ballstadt 98). In "Education and National Sentiment," first published in *Rose-Belford's Canadian Monthly* of February 1881, MacLean states that she "has often noticed with surprise" that textbooks used in the primary and secondary schools of Ontario

> one and all contain next to nothing which is calculated to impress the youthful learner with a sense of the importance of his own country, to awaken in his breast emotions of affection and pride in his native land, or of veneration for the memory of those brave men who, in the face of difficulties and dangers almost unparalleled, opened to Europe the ice-bound gates of this Western New World. (MacLean 102)

MacLean's American birth and education, where colonial independence and nationalism were highly valued, may account for her surprise at the lack of Canadian history in Canadian schools.

Later periods of nationalist fervour have occurred in the twentieth-century; the decade of Canada's Centenary celebrations is epitomized by the debate over a national flag. The substitution of the Maple Leaf for the Union Jack in 1964 was the culmination of a process which began in the 1920s, a process which is represented in my mind by W. Everard Edmonds' *The Canadian Flag Day Book* (1927). According to historian Jonathan Vance, *The Canadian Flag Day Book* was designed "to instil patriotism in schoolchildren," and was still on the curriculum of Ontario schools in 1939 (239). It was published shortly after Empire Day was renamed Flag Day, a name change that was suggested by Edmonds, a high school history teacher in Edmonton. However, the flag that was celebrated on Flag Day remained the Union Jack, nor could it be otherwise in a period when English-speaking Canadians held hegemonic power in Canada. Besides emphasizing the British dominance of Canada's heritage throughout *The Canadian Flag Day Book*, and besides assuming that French-Canadians and other Canadian cultures would assimilate to the English language and culture, Edmonds often uses the metaphor of Britain as mother and Canada as one of her children. This metaphor appears both in the author's discourse and in the imperialist poems by Helen M. Johnson and Albert E. MacNutt, reprinted in Edmonds's book. *The Canadian Flag Day Book* embodies the conjunction of English-Canadian loyalty to the British Empire and pride in the Canadian nation state. Canadian nationalism developed within the imperialist discourse of Empire, but tentative steps toward separation from the imperial centre were being made. Edmonds's book represents one of these steps. In *The Canadian Flag Day Book*, Edmonds describes Canada as "the half-way house of that Empire," because he sees Canada's international role as "the tie and the interpreter between the Empire of Britain and the Republic of the United States" (141). Many Canadians saw their nation state in a similar light. Macbeth referred to Canada as a hyphen between the United States and the United Kingdom, and Marcus Adeney described Canada as "culturally more ambiguous than any other nation on earth," because of the influences generated by the two imperial centres ("The Canadian Predicament" 54).

Historians disagree over the precise relationship between imperialism and nationalism in Canadian history. In *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism 1867-1914*, Carl Berger claims that, in Canada, imperialism operates as a type of nationalism. Imperial Federationists, such as those who formed Canada First, believed that full nation status would be best reached by Canada through the attainment of equal status with other nations within the British Empire. The metaphor of the Empire as a family underlies this argument; Miss Canada's equality with Mother Britannia is achieved through the parent-child separation process, but is achieved decorously within the extended family of the British Empire. As I have argued, the metaphor of the family betrays the masculinist character of nationalist, and I add imperialist, discourses. However, the colonial nationalist belief in nationhood within Empire was also based on material factors of the historical period, such as the fact that Canada's small population and tax base could not raise and maintain an armed force sufficient to resist American invasion, if one should occur.

On the other side of the debate, historian Douglas Cole states, "Canadian imperialism was not a variety or extension of Canadian nationalism" (171). Cole argues that "The ideas and assumptions of Canadian imperialists are best seen as a Britannic or pan-Anglo-Saxon nationalism," because most Canadian imperialists identified ethnically with Britain (171). Cole's argument is ethnocentric because he assumes that, at the time of Confederation, British ethnicity was the basis of English-Canadian identity for both imperialists and nationalists (168). His argument erases the presence of other English-speaking ethnic groups in Canada; as I pointed out in Chapter 1, most Irish immigrants did not support British imperialism. Within English Canada, political, ethnic, and class differences distinguished Canadians of British and Celtic ethnicities. Differences in historical interpretations of the intersection of imperialism and nationalism in Canada suggest the importance of these two discourses in the development of hegemonic ideology in this country.

The *Canadian Flag Day Book* is an example of this ideology; it mobilizes the masculinist discourses of colonialism, imperialism, and nationalism without acknowledging them. Furthermore, Edmonds draws on the masculinist Romantic nationalist assumption that the role of literature is "to unite the world and spread the spirit of brotherhood" (140). According to Margery Fee, Romantic nationalism is an eighteenth-century German intellectual construct (36). "In Romantic nationalist theory," writes Fee, "literature was a vital part of the social and political process, and performed the same kind of function as a charter, a constitution, or a boundary" (Fee 63). Macbeth subscribed to this tenet of Romantic nationalism. In a speech given during the 1939 Canadian Book Week, she said, "Without painting and without music we would be an impoverished race of people; but without literature we wouldn't be people, at all" (CACRO MG59 Vol.2 File 23). Cultural nationalists saw a national English-Canadian literature as a means of achieving national unity and a homogeneous nation; therefore, the status of Canadian literature and the figures who represent it were important to nationalists.

The question of the existence of a Canadian literature as distinct from British or American literatures has been debated throughout Canadian history. This question was often commented upon in the Canadian press, sometimes anonymously. For example, on the twenty-fifth of June, 1910, the Toronto *Star Weekly* published an article titled "Have We a Literature in Canada?" in which the writer castigated the Canadian public for neglecting the development of a national Literature. This lack of development has a material base, according to "Candidus," who writes:

> Some one compiled the story of the attempts to establish magazines in Canada, and some one else, on another occasion, also compiled a record of the shipwrecks on Sable Island. The two chronicles are not dissimilar. The faults do not rest on Canadian authors, but on the Canadian readers who pore over trumpery trash in cheap Yankee periodicals, and create no demand for the best writings of their own countrymen. (7)

The pejorative use of Yankee in the *Star Weekly* signifies the prevalence, until World War II, of fears concerning the United States: fears of political annexation, fears of cultural invasion, fears of materialist supremacy. In the first decade of the twentieth century, Canadians were divided over closer ties to Britain through imperial federation, or free trade with the United States, a political and cultural dichotomy which is explored by Sara Jeannette Duncan in *The Imperialist* (1904). In 1911, the incumbent Liberal government, promoters of reciprocity with the United States, were defeated by the Conservatives, supporters of imperial federation with the British Commonwealth. Anti-Americanism continued through the twenties and thirties, along with support for a continentalist identity. Journalist William Arthur Deacon, a cultural nationalist, told American readers in 1925 that the "awakening of the national spirit is the outstanding fact about Canadian life to-day;..." (*American Mercury* November 1925; reprinted in *Poteen* 21). During the twenties, Canadians demanded more control over their representation in international affairs. According to Stewart Wallace, Canada's acquisition in 1919 of a seat in the League of Nations, a seat which was independent of Great Britain, was "the crowning point in the movement toward Canadian autonomy" (67). The acquisition of this sign of autonomy was applauded by imperialists and nationalists alike, for different reasons; imperialists saw it as an indication of equality within the British Empire, and nationalists saw it as a step toward full independence from the British Empire.

Most historians attribute the rise in Canadian nationalism during the twenties to the military sacrifices Canada made for Britain during WWI. Canada's subsequent expectations surrounding a greater role in the Empire's foreign policy decisions seemed reasonable in view of the fact that 60,000 Canadians lost their lives in the "Great War". An article in the June 1921 issue of *The Canadian Bookman* claims that Canadian writers would not have had the confidence to organize the CAA before Canada took an independent seat in the League of Nations, an independence which arose from Canada's contribution to the war effort (Harrington 45). Jonathan Vance disputes the traditional view of the overwhelming role of WWI in the rise of Canadian nationalism. "Rather than laying the basis for a pan-Canadian nationalism," he writes, "the memory of the Great War drove the two strains [English and French] of nationalism apart" (259). However, Canadians of all ethnicities worked well together in WWI, particularly at Vimy in France, and the unifying power of heroism, camaraderie, and victory was real (Vance 251). The memory of that temporary unity of Canadians on the battlefields of Europe became mythologized through exaggeration and wilful obscurantism surrounding Canadian disunity (Vance 256). Through the mythologizing process, veterans were turned into elite participants in Canadian public discourse, the dead were represented as immortal Christ figures, and the soldier was mythologized as a pacifist, a "son of the Empire," and a citizen-soldier (Vance 108).

In the thirties, a global preoccupation with the social problems of the Great Depression distracted many Canadians from an equally intense nationalism to that which prevailed in the 1920s. However, in Kenneth McNaught's words, the thirties was

> a decade in which Canadians sought a new definition of national purpose. Despite, and partly because of, economic frustration, it was an energetic, speculative decade - one that created a new national sentiment and many of Canada's most important modern institutions. (238)

In 1937, the federal government founded Trans-Canada Air Lines, now known as Air Canada. The development of radio broadcasting was directly related to nationalist goals; the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission (CRBC) was instituted in 1932 and the CBC in 1936. In the same year, the Governor-General's literary awards were instituted by the CAA under the auspices of Governor-General John Buchan, and four years earlier the Dominion Drama Festival was founded in celebration of the best in Canadian theatre. Discussions of nationalism and standards for a national literature continued to interest Canadians from all walks of life. Although English Canada remained dedicated to the British imperialist tradition, the country persisted in its drive toward a postcolonial status. In 1931, Canada achieved "full legal freedom" through the Statute of Westminster, and in 1932 Prime Minister R.B. Bennett, echoing the nineteenth-century nationalist group Canada First, proclaimed his policy of "Canada first, then the Empire" (Hillmer 1756; McNaught 243).

In the forties, continentalism prevailed and WWII dominated at least half of the decade. According to historian Denis Smith, by 1945 Canada's federal leaders and her federal career bureaucrats "were inclined to believe that the country had passed beyond the era of nationalism into internationalism (in diplomacy) and continentalism (in economic and cultural relations with the US), a condition considered blessed" (1200). However, events in Canada suggest that nationalism remained a prominent part of the country's worldview and discourse during the 1940s. Discussions over a new national anthem and a new flag were part of Canadian current affairs, the first Citizenship Act dates from 1947, Pierce continued publishing nationalist literary projects at Ryerson Press, and the Massey Commission, a major event in Canadian cultural history, began its work in 1949.

In 1948, the Canadian Hockey Association's decision against competing in the Olympic Games of that year appalled many Canadians, especially members of the Royal Canadian Air Force (RCAF). The events that followed the Hockey Association's announcement represent the nationalist tone of Canada's cultural and sports arenas during the last half of the forties. Brooke Claxton, federal Minister of Defence, was instrumental in the hasty organization of a national hockey team, which consisted largely of the RCAF hockey team and former armed forces members. After only three weeks of practice, the Canadian team competed at the Olympic Games in St. Moritz, Switzerland, and won the gold medal. At the same Olympic games, Barbara-Ann Scott won the gold medal for female figure-skating. According to journalist Bridget O'Toole, one hockey team member said he felt a surge of national pride as he stood on the podium, listening to the Swiss orchestra play the Maple Leaf Forever. The Swiss were cognizant of the Canadian debates over a new anthem, and, in line with the Canadian nationalist milieu of the forties, they thought that the Maple Leaf Forever had been chosen as the new national anthem of Canada.

The Field of Power and the Literary Field

Between 1920 and 1950, cultural nationalism became established within the English-Canadian literary field, a field divided into two main literary generations, the established Victorian writers and the modernist newcomers. Even though many modernists supported the idea of a national literature, they perceived nationalism as a conservative discourse of the establishment, a discourse deserving of resistance. In 1929, Marcus Adeney (b.1900), modernist writer and musician, published "The Nationalist Myth" in the modernist magazine *The Canadian Mercury*; in his article, Adeney states that nationalism and religion are "too useful to the powers that be" for the latter to allow attacks to be launched by his literary generation against these cultural institutions (59). Adeney's argument is based on the dichotomy that characterizes struggles between young and old artistic generations. In addition, his argument assumes that new literary production threatens the entire cultural and political establishment, whereas, following Bourdieu, I argue that the literary field constitutes a dominated fraction of the dominant field, the field of power. I define the Canadian establishment as those people who control government, educational institutions, and other powerful agencies, such as major corporations, and I argue that only some of those in positions of control were nationalist during this period. Political leaders on the right or centre, such as R.B. Bennett and W.L. Mackenzie King, made nationalist public statements but few administrative changes to institutionalize systemic nationalist practices, such as the preference given today to Canadians for jobs in federal institutions. In this project, I focus on educational institutions, a site of cultural production in which Livesay laboured for many years, and in which I participate.

Academics are not located in the upper echelons of the field of power, but they are part of the establishment due both to their public service role and to their location in the upper classes of Canadian society. Income and occupation are among the main factors used by social scientists to determine class; academics earn an upper-middle income in comparison to the majority of Canadians. Alison Prentice points out that "in 1929, 60 percent of Canadian working men and 82 percent of working women earned less than the minimum necessary for the support of a family of four" (293). A study of Canadian census data from 1920-1950 reveals very little income information for professionals; in that period, Canada's economy was overwhelmingly resource-based, even more so than at the end of the century, and professionals made up an insignificant portion of the population surveyed by the census interviewers. However, academics earned more than twice the salary of a letter carrier and twenty percent more than professional writers in the thirties and forties. Furthermore, gender crosses the class-defining factor of income to produce subclasses in this time period; women in either the educational or literary occupations earned about half the salary of their male colleagues.[65] Irene Biss, Professor at the

University of Toronto during the early thirties, had to work part-time as "a don in residence" because her salary was so low (Horn 25).

My research into early Canadian census records leads me to make two assertions. First, a bias towards the classes and occupations which control power, that is, towards the establishment, is built into the collection methodology and the census data of the period. Census records of 1920-1950 do not mention politicians or chief executive officers (CEOs) of corporations. More recent records bury income information on CEOs and politicians in the broad category "General Managers and Other Senior Officials," a category which includes university administrators, inspectors and regulatory officers, Post Office management, and public servants. This watering-down results in the absurd report by the 1991 Census that the average salary of a male Professor ($53,725) is higher than the average salary of a male CEO or politician ($41,503) (Catalogue 93-332, p.10). In this context, the census of Canada appears to be a means by which the upper echelon maintains control through a powerful gaze which is deliberately unself-reflective; in other words, census data have the potential of performing as a panopticon focused on the majority by a small and powerful sector of society. This potential is greater, it seems to me, in time periods when professionals make up a tiny sector of census records, as is the case in 1920-1950. University professors of those decades constituted a small, educated elite which had relatively more power than do academics of today; their invisibility in the 1921 census protects them from the scrutiny of the public and, therefore, from critique. The fact that many influential Canadians of 1920-1950 were natives of Britain and the United States indicates both the colonial nature of Canadian culture, and the value of the protests raised by nationalists of the period against the cultural colonization of the Canadian educational system. Thirty-five years after MacLean's critical article in *Rose-Belford's Canadian Monthly*, the CAA lobbied provincial departments of education over the lack of Canadian material in educational books of the period (Harrington 179). Furthermore, the presence of British professors and administrators in Canadian universities and cultural institutions, it seems to me, served to perpetuate the imperialist strain in Canadian public discourses.

Academia's role within the English-speaking field of power was, and is, that of cultural and ideological arbitrator, representing the dominant Anglo-American ideology. As John Guillory asserts, the university has a role "in the determination of who writes and who reads, as well as what gets read, and in what contexts" (19). The fact that Canadian educational institutions of 1920-1950 generally did not allocate the same time or materials to either Canadian literature or Canadian history, as they did to British and American literature and history, illustrates this claim. Macbeth noticed the lack of attention to Canadian literature in post-secondary curricula before the turn of the century when she immigrated to Canada from the United States. In her second memoir, Macbeth states that she was not exposed to Canadian literature when she attended Hellmuth College in London, Ontario in 1895; she adds that her college was not unusual in its insistence that students learn only "the classics" (*Boulevard Career* 63). Among English-language literatures, Canadian literature was neither canonical nor classical. Although an archive of Canadian literature had existed for decades, the Canadian literary canon was underdeveloped partly due to the lack of attention to Canadian literature in the Canadian educational system.

The cultural colonization of Canadian educational institutions by British and American interests developed for two reasons. First, most Canadian educators were either British or American immigrants, or Canadians who were themselves trained as teachers in either British or American universities. For instance, the Rockefeller Foundation granted the University of Alberta $3500 for the Alberta Folklore and Local History Project, and sent Robert E. Gard of Cornell University to supervise the foundation of the Project in 1943-44. In addition, the Carnegie Corporation provided grants for the founding of fine arts departments in several Canadian universities in the twenties and thirties, and Carnegie sent American teachers to run these new departments. During the depression, P.E.I.'s department of education depended on the Carnegie Corporation's funding of travelling libraries as a means of reducing their own expenditures (Harrington 179). The Banff School of Fine Art was started with a Carnegie grant and staffed by Americans Frederick Koch, Joseph F. Smith, and Jacques Joles. Canadian playwright Elsie Park Gowan, who studied at the Banff School in 1937, complained that Koch taught an

American genre of playwrighting, "the folk play," a genre which was inappropriate to Canadian literature (Wagner 72). Gowan's colleague Gwen Pharis Ringwood adopted the American genre and subsequently received a Rockefeller Foundation scholarship to study drama at the University of North Carolina. According to Bourdieu, "The state, after all, has the power to orient intellectual production by means of subsidies, commissions, promotions, honorific posts, even decorations, all of which are for speaking or keeping silent, for compromise or abstention" (*Field* 125). Ringwood's reward for speaking the language of the American state, in this case an American philanthropic organization, took the form of a subsidy to study foreign genres at a university in a foreign nation. Theoretically, such a subsidy could develop and perpetuate a continentalist influence in the work of Canadian writers. Nationalists' fear that American influence would prevent the development of a distinct Canadian Literature had a material basis; writers such as Gowan, who did not write in the American folk genre, did not receive an equivalent level of financial support for her writing.[66]

Prominent members of the Canadian establishment, including leftists such as F.R. Scott and Eugene Forsey, both of whom taught at McGill university, received their educations in Britain during the twenties and early thirties under the auspices of the Rhodes Scholarship system. Rhodes Scholarships are funded by Cecil Rhodes, who amassed a fortune from South African diamonds mines, and whose exploitative methods earned him the reputation of being perhaps the most ruthless imperialist entrepreneur of the British Empire. In addition, many Canadian academic positions were filled by British immigrant teachers during the twenties. Eric A. Havelock and Joseph F. Parkinson, both members of the left-wing Canadian League for Social Reconstruction (LSR) which had links to the British socialist Fabian Society, came to Canada to take up university teaching positions. These financial and educational associations created an ideological atmosphere in which the academic suppression of Canadian literature and history could be introduced to Canadian universities and normalized.

Second, the textbooks and teaching methods used in Canadian educational institutions were designed in other countries. Canadian educators adopted American and

British educational methodology and innovations. As David Young explains, "In the early years of the decade [1930s], many Canadian teachers were trained south of the border where they encountered the progressive ideas of educators such as John Dewey, B.H. Bode, E.L. Thorndike, and A.I. Gates" (125). The American education of these Canadians led to the purchase of American textbooks by Canadian school boards, because American teaching methodologies were not available in Canadian textbooks of the time. Moreover, the Carnegie Corporation provided "Arts Teaching Sets" as part of its funding for fine arts programs in Canadian universities; these teaching guides "consist[ed] of books, prints, textiles, and photographs dealing with the history of Western art" (Tippett 145). After 1938, Carnegie teaching materials on art used reproductions of the paintings of American artists Grant Wood and Thomas Hart Benton as examples of the fine art canon (Tippett 153). As Maria Tippett comments, this was one method by which "The [Carnegie] Corporation's programs also fostered the Americanization of [Canadian] institutions and groups in quite direct ways" (Tippett 153). Between 1911 and 1950, the Carnegie Corporation spent over seven million dollars, and the Rockefeller Foundation almost twelve million, on Canadian cultural projects (Staines 34).

Canadian educators were complicit in the devaluation of Canadian history and literature because they perpetuated the cultural cringe of the early settler-invaders of British North America. Cultural cringe is the result of settlers' belief that the colony's culture is infantile and inferior not only in relation to the imperial centre left behind, but also in relation to the Native culture which has long been established in the newly invaded territory. In "Postcolonial Theory and the 'Settler' Subject," Alan Lawson astutely points out that Canadian and Australian settlers desired both the authority of the homeland and the authenticity of Native cultures. In Canada, the cultural cringe which relates to the imperial centre is further fractured by its potential derivation from three imperial centres: France, Britain, and the United States; this cultural cringe manifests itself through close and continual imitation of the various homelands' traditions, mores, political systems, cultural standards, and literary genres.

A primary example of cultural cringe within the Canadian educational establishment is found in the fact that successive waves of Canadian universities continued to be modeled upon foreign universities. The number of universities in Canada grew from seventeen in 1867 to twenty-eight in 1939. The older eastern universities were based on European models, the only models available at the time of their institutionalization. "The 3 King's Colleges (est. at Windsor, NS, 1789; York [Toronto], 1827; and Fredericton, NB, 1828) were efforts to bring the ideals of the older English universities to Canada" write P. Anisef and J. Lennards. "They were residential, tutorial and Anglican" (1872). The newer western universities followed the model of the American state university. According to G.S. Tomkins, American curriculum and teaching methodologies were combined with British "cultural content" because "a lack of resources forced curriculum developers to rely on British and American innovations" (459). My point is that the political will to provide funding for a truly Canadian educational system was nonexistent precisely because of the prevalence of cultural cringe among Canadian leaders. As Heather Murray points out in "From Canon to Curriculum," a curriculum can have a nationalist agenda, as it did in Britain after WW1, and as it does in the United States (237).

The question of which ethnic group would dominate, or continue to dominate, the makeup of the Canadian population was a major factor in the development of Canadian educational institutions. English-speaking Canadians were anxious to maintain their cultural and demographic dominance in Canada, so they applauded the fact that "Anglo-Saxon values infused the curriculum" of Canadian schools modelled on their British and American counterparts (Tomkins 459). These Canadians assumed that educational curricula based on Anglo-Saxon history and language would expedite the assimilation of the large numbers of eastern-European immigrants who entered Canada during the 1890s and 1920s; as mentioned, some even assumed that French-Canadians would assimilate to English-Canadian culture.

The Nationalists

In 1923, Findlay Weaver, editor of the nationalist literary trade journal *Canadian Bookman* conducted a study of Canadian content in the curricula of English departments at several Canadian universities. Weaver sent written queries to all Canadian universities and received responses from the following eight: the Universities of British Columbia, Manitoba, Toronto, Western Ontario, New Brunswick and Dalhousie and Acadia Universities. Six of these institutions of higher learning revealed little interest in teaching Canadian literature. CAA historian Lyn Harrington claims that "only Acadia had a full-term course [on Canadian literature], and had for the past twenty years given courses in Canadian literature and was developing the department" (77). However, as Fee points out, the Ontario Agricultural College, now the University of Guelph, offered a summer course in Canadian literature as early as 1907.

J.D.Logan, a Nova Scotian who taught literature at Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and George B. Cutten, President of Acadia, were the developers of Acadia's Canadian literature curricula. In 1915, Cutten invited Logan to give "the first formal series of lectures on Canadian literature ever given at any university in the British Empire" (Logan 61). Logan's position as a professor gave him the cultural capital and prestige of the academic establishment. He was a nationalist proponent on behalf of Canadian literature, a nationalist who was unable to find academic employment within Canada. Logan's employment record reflects the British and American hegemony within Canadian universities. In 1918, Logan donated his "private library of Canadiana comprising several hundred volumes of Canadian prose and poetry dating from 1763, and hundreds of rare pamphlets, broadsheets, booklets, and whatnot of curiosities of Canadian prose and verse" to Acadia University (61). In a 1920 article, "Teaching Canadian Literature in the Universities," Logan describes the struggle to include Canadian literature in Canadian postsecondary curricula and explains his reasons for the donation to Acadia.

> Acadia possessed no library of Canadian prose and verse, and was thus without material for proof of my contention that Canada had a body of prose and verse which, at its best, was worthy to be included in the *corpus* of English literature and in the survey of English literature as conducted by our universities - as much worthy, in fact, as American literature was worthy of inclusion and was indeed so included. (61)

In 1919 Logan developed the university's first full courses in Canadian literature, and V.B.

Rhodenizer joined him in delivering these courses to Acadia's students. Logan's belief in the role of literature in the development of a nation is clear in the conclusion to "Teaching Canadian Literature":

> What Acadia has achieved and made actual and important, other Canadian universities can also achieve. Should they continue to refuse systematically to include a study of Canadian literature in the general survey of English literature, our universities, would, in my sincere view, grievously sin against their country and its cultural development. (62)

The most pragmatic form of opposition to the cultural cringe that operated within the educational system of Canada came from nationalist Canadian writers and publishers. According to Sandra Campbell, Lorne Pierce, literary editor of Ryerson Press, "criticized provincial ministers of education, in the pages of the *Christian Guardian*, for a lack of Canadian content in the nation's schoolbooks together with the virtual absence of Canadian literature and preponderance of British and American materials" (95). Campbell quotes Pierce's "'Editor's Creed,' afire with nationalism," in which Pierce declares, "The publisher must remain one of the chief forces that make a conscious and sustained effort to enrich and preserve the cultural and spiritual values in our heritage" (93). In 1929, Hugh Eayrs, President of Macmillan Canada, temporarily joined forces with Ryerson to co-publish a series of Canadian textbooks for the Ontario primary and secondary public school systems. The series developed by these two nationalists were produced during the thirties and used in Canadian primary and secondary school systems for over thirty-five years (Campbell 96). Furthermore, Eayrs used the profits from the textbook trade to subsidize the publication of Canadian literature, including Livesay's *Signpost* (1932). The sales of Canadian literature provided Macmillan with only one percent of its revenue; when the purchase of Canadian textbooks dropped during the mid-thirties, Eayrs was forced to reduce the number of Canadian literary texts published by Macmillan Canada.[67]

International publishing firms such as Macmillan took a risk by publishing Canadian literature in the small Canadian market. The major part of most Canadian publishing firms' business lay in importing British and American books for sale in

Canada. The small market for Canadian books may have been the downfall of a Canadian nationalist publishing company, the Graphic publishing company of Ottawa, which collapsed during the Depression. Advertisements placed in the *Canadian Bookman* by Graphic in 1927 read "Canadian Literature is Enriched by Graphic Books - Every Graphic Book is a Canadian Book" (Harrington 123). The *Manitoba Free Press* ran the following Graphic advertisement: "'Graphic' Books Are Good All-Canadian Literature" (1 Nov. 1926: 12). Graphic began operations in 1925 and before it went bankrupt in 1932, it published five of Macbeth's works. F.P. Grove, an important figure in the field of Canadian literature, was an editor at Graphic for almost two years. Nationalist publishers such as Ryerson, Macmillan, and Graphic were encouraged in their work by the CAA which founded the Canadian Book Week in 1921 to promote reading and, in particular, the reading of Canadian writing.

The CAA represents nationalism in the field of Canadian literature. It began operation in 1921 "to act for the benefit of Canadian authors, and to procure adequate copyright legislation" (Harrington 300). Canadian copyright legislation proposed that year gave Canadian printers the right to publish, without the author's permission, any book by a Canadian author that was not already published in Canada. Stephen Leacock's vehement opposition to this proposed legislation motivated him to call the initial meeting at which the CAA was launched. Macbeth was on the CAA's copyright committee with J.M. Gibbon, the organization's first president, and Louvigny de Montigny, a "gifted" Canadian dramatist who excelled in satire (Forsyth 315). The copyright committee pointed out to the government that the proposed legislation contravened international copyright law, known as the Berne Convention. Canadian legislation was in contravention by removing the author's "right to make his own terms with the licensee" and by taking control over abridgments and cheap editions from the hands of authors (Harrington 35). The Canadian government's signature on the Berne Convention on copyright would support its case for Canadian autonomy within the British Empire. At the same time, the government was influenced by a strong lobby from the printing trade, which wanted to expand its business. The government's solution to these contradictory desires was unique: it amended all clauses in contravention to the international copyright law, with the stipulation that the amendments applied only to citizens of other countries, not to Canadians. As the outraged Canadian writer and illustrator Arthur Heming said, "[t]he only way a Canadian author can protect his work in Canada is to swear allegiance to a foreign country and then that privilege is at once granted to him" (Harrington 39). In protest, Heming moved to the United States after the new Canadian Copyright Act went into effect on January 1, 1924.

The loss of Canadian talent, such as Heming,[68] damaged the movement for a national literature in Canada, a movement that particularly concerned the CAA, but not the politicians. For a state that actively pursued symbols of full nationhood, the treatment of Canadian authors seems paradoxical. Three factors account for the CAA's loss of the 1921-24 copyright war. First, L.J. Burpee reported a Canadian senator saying, "Well, there are more printers than authors," and this curt statement implies that a larger tax base, more voters, and more job production recommended the printers to the politicians (Harrington 91). Second, in comparison to the masculinized technical field of printing, writing was feminine; as such, literature was devalued in the eyes of most people, including those in power. Third, Canadian authors lacked a strong advocate within government. According to Harrington, both Prime Minister Arthur Meighen and Opposition Leader W.L. Mackenzie King supported writers in principle; however, nothing concrete resulted from their verbal support in the House of Commons (34). Even though several Members of Parliament introduced bills that supported the CAA's position on copyright, their efforts "die[d] through government indifference" (Vipond "The CAA in the 1920s" 70). In the forties, Minister of Defence Brooke Claxton spoke for the writers and artists of Canada when he convinced Prime Minister St. Laurent to institute the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences; however, the twenties produced no such powerful advocate for author's rights.

As mentioned, Macbeth was an early member of the CAA; she was the first Secretary of the Ottawa Branch in 1921, President of the same branch in the forties, and the National President from 1939 to 1942, achievements that are put into perspective by

Mrs. Valance Patriarche's description of the 1925 CAA convention as "a man's show" (116). Of the thirty national presidents between 1921 and 1981, only five were female, even though the majority of the CAA's members were also female. Carole Gerson has calculated that "[i]n 1924 45% of the more than 800 English-speaking members of the CAA were women, and 16% of the 74 members of the French section. By 1933, women were 58% of some 730 English-speaking members, and 24% of the French ("The Business of a Woman's Life..." 93 fn 53). In spite of the female-dominated nature of the organization, the CAA's division of tasks reveals systemic power imbalances based on traditional gender roles. As I explain in Chapter 5, the *Alberta Poetry Year Books*, published by the Edmonton chapter of the CAA, were edited by women, although the contents were almost always selected by male judges (Harrington 250). Likewise, most contributors to the CAA's journal, *The Canadian Poetry Magazine*, were female, while "nearly all the editors" were male (Harrington 256). Harrington states that the CAA's "organizing committee was chagrined to learn that the majority attending [the inaugural meeting] were to be women. They could make the time for travel," presumably because they were not employed in the public sphere (Harrington 22). In 1941, as he looked back to the first meeting, Gibbon recalled that the chagrin over "the perfectly horrible discovery that nearly all Canadian authors were women - 90 out of 120, to be exact" was due to the fact that the University of Montreal, where the meetings were originally scheduled, "didn't recognize women except as the wives of their husbands" (NAC MG30 D52 Vol.15 Scrapbook 1941-1950 "Authors Honored at Final Banquet"). The meetings were hastily moved to McGill University. If the organizers themselves, Leacock, Pelham Edgar, Gibbon, and Sandwell, felt that their new organization would be devalued by the participation of women writers, is it any wonder that F.R. Scott could write "The Canadian Authors Meet"?[69]

At the inaugural conference in 1921, all the top executive positions of the CAA were filled by men, but two women were elected to the post of vice-president, Isabel Ecclestone Mackay and Nellie McClung (Harrington 24). Furthermore, the "large Council of twenty-two" had only seven women, one of whom was Macbeth (Harrington 24).[70]

Macbeth's leadership qualities were publicly acknowledged by the CAA's male hegemony when she was asked to address the CAA's inaugural meeting. The invitation was extended at the last minute, indeed as Macbeth sat in the audience, and was extended in response to complaints from women concerning the male head table and the male list of speakers who faced a predominantly female audience; as such, it was a token gesture (Macbeth *Boulevard Career* 227-228). In this period, the CAA represents the masculine and masculinist field of Canadian literary nationalism, a field in which many women operated, but few held positions of leadership.

Like other struggling young writers, Macbeth sought support from the network of writers available to members of the CAA. She had already acquired tangible evidence of the value of professional support; in late 1916, Macbeth signed an unfavourable contract with Small Maynard publishers of Boston for her novel, *Kleath* (1917) (NAC MG30 D52 Vol.5, File: Contracts 1910-1929). As was the convention in the field of publishing, the contract gave Small Maynard international copyright to the novel. The publisher sold the story to the Mayflower Photoplay Corporation, which produced a film version of Macbeth's novel, *The Law of the Yukon*. The film's title was taken from a poem by Robert Service, and the film's credits read "Based on the poem by Robert W. Service" (Copyright description, Library of Congress, Sept.18, 1920). The Authors League of America complained on Macbeth's behalf, and although she eventually "got enough money from the venture to buy a cheap fur coat," her work was never acknowledged publicly by the film's producers (*Boulevard Career* 118). In a speech to CAA members at the 1924 Convention in Quebec City, Macbeth explains her view of the value of an organization for writers:

> For the first few years of my writing, I did not know a single fellow craftsman. When at a luncheon of the Authors League of America I first met half a dozen struggling writers, I learned more in an hour than I had during all the years I had been writing. Authors must have a common meeting ground. (Harrington 86)

Macbeth's isolation as a writer was partly sex-based; as a female writer and a single mother, Macbeth worked at home, whereas most professional male writers worked in academia, government, or journalism. The CAA's predominantly female membership indicates the high incidence of isolation among women writers, and the CAA provided a Canadian version of the common meeting ground that Macbeth had found in the Authors League of America. As CAA member Robert Allison Hood said about the organization's inaugural year: "Those interested in writing took new heart in their work, inspired by fellowship with others of kindred interests" (Harrington 205). Practical information on the material conditions of the professional writer in Canada was compiled, discussed, and distributed; resources, mentorship, group publication, and discussion groups were provided for CAA members.

In 1928, the President of the CAA, Sir Charles G.D.Roberts, described the organization as a "Guild of Workers" and a "broadly and liberally inclusive" organization (Harrington 102). "We include not only those who have arrived," he said, "but those who are arriving, and those who are striving earnestly to arrive" (Harrington 102). Roberts's comment highlights the operation of competitive literary generations within the field of literary production, a field that operated within a competitive capitalist economic system. In addition, Roberts's comment homogenizes literary generations by ignoring, for instance, differences between the goal(s) of established and newer generations. The CAA's emphasis on the material realities of the literary profession led to the perception on the part of the modernist opposition, such as the editors of *The Canadian Forum*, that the CAA was a self-serving and self-promoting organization.

Livesay viewed the CAA in this light; nevertheless, she joined the CAA in 1947. In a letter to *Saturday Night*, dated April 6, 1949, Livesay publicly positioned herself at the pure-art end of the popular-literature/pure-art continuum by siding with Canadian modernist writers such as Malcolm Lowry and A.M. Klein, who, she wrote, "rightly remain outside its [the CAA's] ranks, as well as some dozen excellent poets, because they are concerned with their craft, and not with making money" (UA 96-69, Queens Box 2, File 25). "I joined the Canadian Authors Association some two years ago," she wrote, "in the hope that it might be possible to awaken the Association to a realization of prevailing literary standards and to extend the hand of Canadian writers to younger ones at home and to contemporary ones abroad. After one year's work I had to admit failure" (File 25). In the same letter, Livesay characterized the CAA as "the most undemocratic organization in Canada," because it did not arrange for elected delegates from the regions to attend its national convention; Livesay objected to this practice, claiming that "the inevitable result is that cliques can and do control the affairs of the Association" (File 25).

Furthermore, in 1971, when she was a professor of Canadian literature at the University of Manitoba, Livesay wrote to the local CAA executive in Winnipeg to complain about the poor calibre of the speaker at one of their meetings. The following year, Bess Kaplan, of the Winnipeg CAA's executive, invited Livesay to read from her work at the 1973 national convention, which was being planned for Winnipeg. The CAA was unable to offer Livesay either an honorarium or travel expenses from Victoria, where Livesay taught English at the University of Victoria, because CAA applications to the Canada Council for funding had been refused. "Officious officials there have told our national executive members that if they want so-and-so," Kaplan wrote to Livesay, "they can damn well take it out of members' fees, increase fees, or whatever" (UM Mss37 Box 59 Fd 5). Kaplan adds, "We have never received a sympathetic hearing from anyone there [in the Canada Council]" (UM Mss37 Box 59 Fd 5). Kaplan's statement is seconded by Harrington, who wrote in 1981: "the Canada Council has remained non-supportive, on the grounds that non-professional writers comprised too large a percentage of the membership of the CAA" (245). As a government-funded agency which operates simultaneously in the fields of power and culture, the Canada Council's decisions have material effects on the organization of the Canadian literary field. In its first budget of 1957, the Council refused to fund any of the CAA's activities. Twenty years later, some funding was authorized for bringing "outside speakers" to CAA conventions (245).

Canadian Book Week was the major vehicle of dissemination for the CAA's nationalist message. Vipond states that "[t]he CAA sent official letters to the Canadian Teachers Federation encouraging an active response to Book Week, and they lobbied year-round for more Canadian content in school curricula" (Vipond 71). Sandwell praised Macbeth for the "surprising results" she achieved with branch activities during the 1922

Canadian Book Week. "Any association which can enlist the services of such executives as Madge Macbeth (Ottawa) Jessie G. Sime (Montreal) and Hugh Eayrs (Toronto)," he wrote, "can count on getting things done" (Harrington 74-75). In addition, the Editor of the Ottawa *Citizen* believed that CAA members got a lot done. Commenting on the Book Week of 1925, he wrote: "The book buying public today is far better informed on the activities and accomplishments of Canadian authors than it was four years ago, and to the efforts of the Authors Association is this fact very largely due" ("Significance of Canadian Book Week" 201).

As a site of nationalists' and internationalists' dispute over art versus commerce, Canadian Book Week was surrounded by controversy from its inception. As early as 1921, concerns about the quality of the publications listed in the Book Week's promotion material were raised by CAA members. Gibbon's answer to these concerns reflects the CAA's desire to increase readership of Canadian literary productions, regardless of the location of the productions on the popular-literature/pure-art continuum:

> The Association is not a private literary club, nor an Academy to weigh the virtues and demerits of a country's literature. A frontier story of action and adventure may be just as valuable in winning readers as a treatise on Milton or Flaubert to a college professor. (Harrington 64)

Modernist nationalists, internationalists, art for art's sake writers and intellectuals, that is, those who operated in the restricted area of the field of Canadian literary production, saw the Book Week as a commodification and a fetishization of literature to whip up nationalist fervour, just as the South African Tweed Trek of 1938 was, in Anne McClintock's words, "a commodity spectacle" intended to produce "a sense of popular, collective unity" (374). McClintock's remarks draw on the Marxist view of nationalism as a fetishism which uses "mass rallies, the myriad forms of popular culture and so on" to conceal relations of power (McClintock 374-375; Scruton 76). In the eyes of its detractors, Canadian Book Week fetishized literature by colluding with publishers and popular-literature writers, a collusion designed to separate the reading public from its money, that is, a purely commercial venture with no redeeming aspects. However, arguments among supporters of and opponents to Canadian Book Week amount to more than debates over literary standards, the commercialization of art, and the popular-literature/pure-art binary; they concern issues of control over the field of cultural production and the direction it should take. In Anthony Smith's terms, Canadian Book Week was an "invented tradition," or "a deliberate invention and construction" designed to further cultural nationalism through nationalist discursive practices (Hobsbawm and Smith in Smith 354, 356).

When President Watson Kirkconnell ended the CAA's participation in Canadian Book Week in 1957, he said that the CAA was a front for the major beneficiaries of the event, the publishers, and that it was time for the publishers to run the Book Week themselves. If the Book Week was controlled by publishers in 1957, it was not controlled by them at its inception in 1921; it took seven years for the Canadian Book Week to become "an established event, and [for] booksellers and publishers [to] overcome their skepticism" concerning the value of the event (Harrington 65). Kirkconnell's position as a literary critic in academia places him in the ranks of the dominated fraction of the dominant class, those who stand for the preservation of literature as an institution of high culture; he was a professor of English Literature at the University of Manitoba, at McMaster University, and was later President of Acadia University. However, Kirkconnell's dismissal of the 1957 Book Week as merely a vehicle to increase publishers' sales, while partisan, contains an element of truth. Hugh Eayrs's position on the executive of the Toronto branch of the CAA gave many writers cause for concern because of his connections to Macmillan Canada. Eayrs's position was not an anomaly; Donald French, an editor with Macmillan Canada, founded the Canadian Literature Club of Toronto to support Book Week and to educate the public about Canadian literature (Harrington 60).[71] The extra-curricular activities of these two men, who were major figures in one of the most active publishing companies in Canada, can be interpreted as marketing efforts to construct a canon which would include, and therefore promote, their company's Canadian literary productions. However, links between other publishers, national organizations, and partisan groups also occurred during the same time period. S.B.

Watson, Manager of Thomas Nelson Publishing Company, was a member of the LSR when Nelson published LSR books and pamphlets. No public outcry arose over this conflict of interest. The frequency of such vested activities illustrates some of the ways in which the political and social positions of publishers intersect with their business decisions.

Canadian Book Week was organized and run by the CAA from 1921 until 1957, with 1928 being its "pinnacle...when an immense gathering [of 1000 people] filled and overflowed Convocation Hall, University of Toronto" (Harrington 78). In the late 1970s, the federal government instituted and funded the Children's and National Book Festivals, reincarnations of the CAA's Book Week. The tradition of Canadian Book Week continues to this day in the variously named displays of Canadian literary production which are strategically held in October and November, in order to exploit the market for Christmas gifts. In Edmonton, The Alberta Book Fair Society organizes a one-day version of Canadian Book Week, a fair at which books are donated by publishers for door prizes. In Toronto, the Festival of Books, which is held annually at Harbourfront, attracts writers from around the world. In spite of its critics, the CAA's Canadian Book Week has had an enduring influence in the field of Canadian letters. However, it is significant that the 1997 event in Toronto was advertised as an international festival of literature. In a period when internationalism is valorized more than nationalism, counter-nationalists have gained the power to rename an event which is rooted in Canadian cultural nationalism.

In this chapter, I have been defining the field of power by its members: the establishment and the nationalists. I examine a third group, the internationalists, in the next chapter. However, I want to emphasize that an absolute dichotomy does not separate any of these groups. The CAA welcomed nationalists, and those Canadian writers who were nationalists were likely to belong to the CAA, but some of the CAA's members also participated in the establishment. The latter represent the portion of the field of power that ascribed to cultural nationalism. For instance, Gibbon was an administrator with the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR). His position in the CPR benefited CAA members in various ways: the railway provided free rail passes to members who attended CAA conventions, and the railway's staff made the international arrangements for the CAA's literary tour of England in 1933. Other national Presidents of the CAA had establishment careers as civil servants, academics, church ministers, and politicians.[72] Besides differences in the field at large, each group discussed was riddled with internal differences. In practice, the *Bookman*, a cultural journal affiliated with the CAA,[73] was more of an open forum than the *Canadian Forum*. Articles from the left, the center, and the right were published in the *Bookman*, but the *Forum* editors chose work from the left of the political spectrum. For example, Marcus Adeney was an internationalist and modernist who contributed frequently to the Bookman through articles and a regular book review column; his writing also appeared in the *Canadian Forum*. In "The *Canadian Bookman* and Literary Nationalism," Jim Mulvihill comments: "As one of the founding contributors to the brash, young *Canadian Mercury*, Adeney could hardly be accused of being a Maple Leafer" (54). A survey of the debates published in the *Canadian Bookman* indicates the heterogeneity within the CAA. Between 1923 and 1939, fourteen articles on nationalist consciousness in Canada appeared in the *Canadian Bookman*'s pages. Nationalist writers were criticized in responding articles as well as in letters to the editor. One discussion of Canadian literature went on for five months in 1933 with seven writers participating. Differences among leftist Canadians certainly existed; this is clear from the formation of *New Frontier* in 1936. As Livesay reveals in *The Canadian Forum*'s fiftieth anniversary edition, "[e]ventually the politics of the *Forum* appeared too pale pink to satisfy some of us, so Leo Kennedy, myself and J.F. White (who had been a *Forum* editor) united to form the left-wing Marxist monthly *New Frontier*" ("The early days" 36). It is notable that Livesay, Kennedy, and White chose to leave the arena of contention, whereas *Bookman* contributors felt comfortable engaging in argument within its pages. English-Canadian nationalist organizations and publications of the period were not the ultra-traditional bastions of conservatism that critics sometimes claim they were.[74]

Women and Nationalism

As mentioned, Macbeth was national President of the CAA from 1939-1942. During the early years of WWII, she used her leadership position to rally Canadian writers and Canadian women around the voluntary war effort. Macbeth's youngest son Douglas was a Lieutenant-Colonel in the Canadian army; he was posted to England, where he was closely involved in the technical organization of the Dieppe offensive ("Lt.-Col. D. Macbeth Pays High Tribute To Men At Dieppe" NAC MG30 D52 Vol.14 Scrapbook 1940-1944). In 1940, Macbeth participated in an unsuccessful attempt by the Ottawa Women's War Campaign to raise $10,000, according to an *Ottawa Citizen* article, "to buy war equipment for Canadian soldiers in England to replace some of that lost in France" ("Women's War Campaign Quarters Will Remain Open Next Week." NAC MG30 D52 Vol.14 Scrapbook 1936-1945). Macbeth's support for the Canadian state and for the Allies in WWII is evident in a speech she gave during the Ottawa Women's War Campaign fund-raising drive: "Canada is calling her men. She is also calling her women...Every soldier in the service has a claim upon every citizen behind the lines" ("Women's War Campaign Quarters"). Macbeth's choice to work for this particular campaign is far less traditional than the war work performed by women's church groups, which often took the form of hand-knitted socks for soldiers.[75] In 1941, Macbeth went on a speaking tour of Canada, as the President of the CAA; she addressed women's groups and explained her nontraditional view of women's wartime roles. In her speech to the Women's Canadian Club of Winnipeg, Macbeth declared, "Knitting and sewing isn't enough for women to do now. Ministering to the wounded isn't enough. What we have to do is buy more and more guns, anti-aircraft, and equipment of all sorts" ("Speaker Urges Every 'Possible Sacrifice, Every Aid For Britain'." NAC MG30 D52 Vol.14 Scrapbook 1940-1944). Furthermore, Macbeth accused Canadian women who sent care packages to occupied Europe, rather than to unoccupied Britain, of being Canada's fifth columnists, a term that refers to civilian spies or traitors.[76] Moreover, she supported allied anti-fascist propaganda, and expressed a right-wing position on trade unionism. In her speeches, Macbeth opposed strikes during wartime; she described strikers as "just as much deserters as soldiers who leave their posts," and she asserted, "Strikers should be regarded as fifth columnists" ("Voluntary System Held Failure Here," and "Active Service Held Mark of True Patriot." MG30 D52 Vol.14 Scrapbook 1940-1944). She believed that Canadian women should support "total national service" and full rationing ("Active Service"). Finally, before she left the presidency of the CAA, Macbeth supported a decision to form a Writers War Committee in which CAA members would volunteer to write propaganda which could be used both inside and outside Canada by the government ("Writers Aid U.S. in War." NAC MG30 D52 Vol.14 Scrapbook 1940-1944).[77] The positions taken by Macbeth on issues related to the war effort were designed to support the state in its mobilization of people and material.

Macbeth's thought and work during WWII suggests a tension between conformity to governmental policies and nonconformity to women's role within those policies. Like Macbeth and the majority of Canadians, Livesay was antifascist, but she was much less active a supporter of WWII than Macbeth. Before war was declared, Livesay was a Marxist and pacifist who saw war in terms of class; armed forces were unequal, hierarchical organizations in which the working class was exploited by powerful capitalist imperialists. However, for many on the political left, antifascism was more important than the principle of peace. In *Right Hand Left Hand*, Livesay notes that she and Duncan were initially undecided about supporting WWII. "Our solution," she writes, "was to withdraw, to settle down to family life on the North Shore" (278). During this time, Livesay worked on modernist documentary poetry, a form that seems appropriate to her sense of reservation. "West Coast," written in 1943, documents a shipyard in wartime, the transformation of a sleepy suburb into a busy town, and an outsider's transition from hesitancy to commitment, just as Livesay herself moved from sceptical pacifism to support for the war. "[T]he poem contains a counterpoint," she writes. "[A]gainst the energy of the workers is heard an outsider's voice - that of an intellectual or poet who cannot at first make up his mind to join the war effort" (*The Documentaries* 24).

Macbeth had no such quandary; she was firmly behind the war effort, which she always described as British-led, and she declared her anti-Nazism in highly inflammatory language; in fact, Barbara Freeman describes Macbeth as "a patriot and a propagandist" (264). When visiting her American relatives before the United States entered WWII in 1942, Macbeth said in an interview, "In some way or another, Germany must be dismembered. We must wipe out this ideology in the minds of the Germans. If we can't do it in a more humane way, then we ought to kill them off" ("People Must Realize It's Up to Them to Win War." MG30 D52 Vol.14 Scrapbook 1940-1944). The ideology to which she refers is "the idea that their race is the muscled one of the earth, prized above all and extremely favored in the sight of God" ("People Must Realize"). As we shall see, Macbeth was just as concerned about the Anglo-American race as the Germans were about the Saxon race. Macbeth's discourse on Nazism and the Allied cause is not self-reflexive; that is, there is no acknowledgement of ideological motives within Allied ranks, even though she publicly urges the development of Allied propaganda. "If we don't study propaganda, and make use of it, this war will be a long, grim, ghastly struggle," she said to the Westmount Women's Club in a 1941 speech ("Mrs. M. Macbeth Blames Strikes on Labor Leaders." NAC MG30 D52 Vol.14 Scrapbook 1940-1944).

In view of Macbeth's conservative politics during WWII, it is not surprising that her earlier life reveals the traditional female pattern of adopting the nationality of a husband, a pattern which was discussed in Chapter 2. As Anthony Smith points out, "[t]he communal past defines to a large extent our identity..." (358). Since Macbeth's habitus was formed in the United States, the development of her Canadian nationalism was a major change, but one that fits the feminine role. Macbeth seems to have downplayed her American background after her marriage, and she was not alone in doing so. Ruth Higgins, writer and member of the CAA, was also an American who married a Canadian "and adopted his country enthusiastically" (Harrington 110). An example of Higgins's enthusiasm occurred in 1927; she "gave the most impassioned address at the Calgary convention [of the CAA], on Canadian history and biography" (Harrington 109-110). Macbeth's and Higgins's adoption of their husbands' nationality is naturalized by the masculinist paradigm of feminine dependence on men. In addition to traditional femininity, the Canadian nationalism of these two former Americans may have been motivated by other factors, such as the anti-American discourse of many fellow Canadians. As Bruce Whiteman states, "Anti-Americanism was particularly strong during the period following the Reciprocity Agreement of 1911 and in the early years of the war" (70).

Another important aspect of female participation in nation building and female assistance to the state is found in the philanthropic work of upper- and middle-class women. During the immigration surge before the turn of the century, fears that the English Canadian majority would be overwhelmed by Eastern European immigrants led to the institution of preferential immigration laws in Canada and elsewhere (Roberts 118). In support of this discriminatory legislation, wealthy female Canadian reformers organized the Women's National Immigration Society (WNIS) to found and manage "homes for the reception of female immigrants," where working-class women could be interviewed and redirected to positions as domestic servants (Roberts 113). According to Barbara Roberts, the organizers of the WNIS saw themselves as "Empire builders" and proposed that the shortage of domestic servants in Canada be filled by British rather than European women (Roberts 111). R.G. Moyles and Doug Owram estimate that eighteen percent of female British immigrants to Canada were middle-class during this period, and the rest were lower-middle-class (210). Middle class British women were manipulated into becoming "genteel domestic servants" in the colonies through imperialist propaganda which portrayed their emigration as the British middle-class woman's role in the imperial mission to civilize the Empire (Moyles & Owram 195-196).

Imperialism and social Darwinism intersect with nationalism in the WNIS, and the volunteer work performed by these upper-class Canadian women provides a case of gender, class, and ethnic interests shaping the direction of female entry into a masculine arena, politics. The founding of the WNIS was based on the personal needs of its founders, who depended on domestic servants to perform household duties while they organized one of the few feminized fields of Canadian public life. In patriarchies, the entry of women into politics follows a gendered division of labour; the church, education, health care, and philanthropy are deemed appropriate arenas for women because they valorize feminine characteristics such as morality and compassion. In her study of South Africa, McClintock found that the work of inventing the Afrikaner nation was also based on a gendered division of labour, with men in political and economic roles, and women in moral and cultural roles (377). In Canada, maternal feminism motivated the prohibition campaigns of 1914-1927. At the end of the nineteenth century, the work of the WNIS was materially valuable to the Canadian state, but gendered expectations and double standards mitigated against a female-run organization having control of any public funds; the women of the WNIS supported their organization through private fund-raising. In 1887, the government allocated only three-tenths of one percent of the Immigration Department's annual budget to the WNIS (Roberts 114). Between 1897 and 1903, the WNIS lobbied the Laurier government intensively for a budget of $10,000; they received an increase of only $500, an amount which put their annual governmental revenue at $1500, for which paltry sum they performed a service which was materially and culturally valuable to the Canadian nation and state, a service which was based on the ideology of an imperial race and Anglo Saxon superiority (Roberts 119). In addition to lack of governmental monetary support, the WNIS had no direct say in the legislative or bureaucratic decision making which affected their work.

Macbeth was connected to the founders of the WNIS by employment, class, sex, and the conjunction of maternal feminism and the New Woman. At Hellmuth College, Macbeth met Lady Aberdeen (Lady Ishbel Marjoribanks Gordon, Countess of Aberdeen), wife of the Governor-General of Canada from 1893 to 1898, organizer of the National Council of Women, and chair of the WNIS's 1896 conference, which was held at the annual meeting of the National Council of Women.[78] Macbeth became Lady Aberdeen's secretary in 1895. In 1944, two of Macbeth's articles for *Saturday Night* reveal that she continued to share class, imperialist, and nationalist interests similar to those of Lady Aberdeen and the WNIS. In these articles, "A New Psychological Approach to Home-Keeping is Needed" and "Raise Her Status and the Worker May Return to the House," Macbeth addresses a national topic, the reconstruction of Canadian society after the turmoil of WWII; in particular, she suggests some ways to entice young Canadian working-class women to become domestic servants. The movement of Canadian female employees into nontraditional areas of work during WWII created a shortage of domestic workers. By 1943, 1,200,000 women were in the Canadian workforce and 250,000 were employed in the manufacturing sector; many others preferred clerical employment to domestic service. Macbeth's remedial suggestions included the improvement of the class of domestic workers through their further education.[79] Her argument for the return of female workers to domestic service is self-serving in the same way that the volunteer work of the WNIS was based on a desire to enter the public arena, while maintaining feminine home duties; as a mother, a widow, and a professional writer, Macbeth required the assistance of a housekeeper.

In "A New Psychological Approach to Home-Keeping is Needed," Macbeth begins by stating her support for a recently released government report on the postwar "rehabilitation of women," a report which recommends "minimum wages, training schools, social security, regular working hours and other reforms to raise the status of domestics" (38). The report referred to by Macbeth was submitted to the House of Commons in January 1944 by the Subcommittee on the Post-War Problems of Women. According to Gail Cuthbert Brandt, it took almost two years of lobbying to get a subcommittee dedicated to women's issues included in the male Committee on Reconstruction, which began its work in March 1941.[80] Furthermore, the Subcommittee was pressured by antifeminist members of Mackenzie King's Cabinet to complete its work in only eleven months, whereas the male-dominated Subcommittees on postwar reconstruction had almost three years.

The Subcommittee on the Post-War Problems of Women consisted of ten upper and middle-class women who, like Macbeth, were employers of domestic help.[81] Most were women who dedicated their time to public service and were related to men in powerful public positions, a profile that resembles the WNIS volunteers. For example, the Chair of the Subcommittee, Margaret Stovel McWilliams was married to the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, and they were both "close personal friends of Mackenzie King" (Brandt 243). Margaret MacKenzie, "a devoted patron of the arts," was married to the

President of the University of New Brunswick (Brandt 243). Another member, A. Vibert Douglas, was herself Dean of Women and Professor of Astronomy at Queen's University. Brandt points out that, except for Grace MacInnis who represented labour and the left, "the Subcommittee members did not represent a cross-section of Canadian womanhood since they were overwhelmingly well-educated, of British origin, Protestant, and middle-aged" (245).

Both Macbeth's self-identification with the Subcommittee members and her position as employer is clear from the syntax she adopts in the two articles. When she writes about the employer of domestic help, Macbeth includes herself in this group by using phrases such as "I and several friends" or "Among my friends" ("Raise Her Status 32). Furthermore, she refers to working-class employees as "girls" and "twirps," but to the middle- and upper-class employers as "women" and "employers" ("A New Psychological Approach" 38; "Raise Her Status" 32). Although Macbeth's use of (working-class) "girls" and (middle-class) "women" follows hegemonic discourses which favour class distinctions, she is aware of the connotative power of words. "The word servant is generally distasteful," she writes. "Alternatives are household clerk, assistant, helper, housekeeper" ("Raise Her Status" 32). At the same time as she attempts to mediate between employee and employer, Macbeth participates in the perpetuation of a double hierarchy of gender and class. Her discourse unquestioningly accepts gendered occupations and class distinctions. She writes:

> A girl I interviewed asked mildly, "How can Mrs. Blank expect me to take an interest in her house and children, when she herself avoids both as much as possible? She makes me feel that she's above this job.
>
> On the other side of the picture, it must not be overlooked that while the "work" of such an employer may not be so obvious to her helper as that of a lawyer or an insurance broker is to *his*, hers is the task of budgeting, planning and organizing. Hers is the final responsibility if things go wrong. She is not always a club fiend or bridge player. ("Raise Her Status" 32)

Furthermore, Macbeth justifies class difference between domestic helper and homeowner by using examples from other occupations to show that hierarchy exists in all areas of society. She points to separate entrances for the staff of department stores and the customers, and separate entrances in theatres for the performers and the patrons, as justification for domestic workers using the back door of the house in which they are employed.

In these articles, Macbeth also participates in the promotion of the domestic science ideology which attempts to professionalize housework by creating links between housework and science, medicine, and efficiency studies.[82] The domestic science model of the household was useful to the establishment's goal of convincing working women to willingly return to the home when unemployed male veterans returned from WWII. Brandt quotes a 1944 Gallup poll which revealed that seventy-five percent of men and sixty-eight percent of women agreed with the Civil Employment Reinstatement Act of 1942 which "made it mandatory for employers to rehire veterans, even if it meant releasing employees who had replaced them during the war" (Luce in Brandt 253 fn 50; 241). This Act was a form of institutionalized discrimination on the basis of sex, a discrimination that was justified by both patriotism and traditional gender roles, a discrimination which had very material consequences for about 180,000 to 200,000 Canadian women "who would not be absorbed into the work-force once peace returned, or would not be leaving it for marriage and home duties" (Brandt 249). The Subcommittee also conducted its own poll through the widespread distribution of questionnaires to women who worked for manufacturers of war products, to their employers, to the government, to business groups, to public service providers such as hospitals and schools, and to women's organizations (Brandt 245-248). It is important to note that the small sample of female Canadian employees who were interviewed by the Subcommittee wanted the Act to apply to married women, not to single or widowed women whose survival was more dependent upon equal access to employment opportunities (Brandt 247). Although Canadian women appear to have been aware of the fact the Civil Employment Reinstatement Act of 1942 was not in their best interests, they also appear to have been well interpellated by existing systems of power imbalances between the sexes.

As Brandt writes, "It is obvious from the questionnaires and interviews that most Canadians wanted to see women return home after the war" (253). This acquiescence of the majority of Canadians proves the strength of a masculinist hegemony in Canada during this period.

Macbeth's articles in *Saturday Night* of 1944 uphold the hegemonic ideology of the social relations of gender, that is, the appropriateness of the feminine private sphere for female Canadians and the appropriateness of the masculine public sphere for male Canadians. Her own participation in the masculine public field of journalism was mediated not only by her responsibilities as a single mother, but also by her decision to write soft journalism for a column titled "The Feminine Outlook," where the articles under discussion appeared. However, Macbeth was not being hypocritical in advocating a return to housework for Canadian working-class women. Upon her widowhood, she learned homemaking from financial necessity, and she may have understood the employment of a housekeeper as an inevitable and natural aspect of her professional life. The material reality of Macbeth's life drew her into complicity with the prevailing ideology that promoted housework as a full time career for the true woman, and the return to the home as a patriotic gesture. In the first published article of the two, "A New Psychological Approach to Home-Keeping is Needed," she writes:

> the first step, as I see it, is to stamp out the prejudice against housekeeping; to show that happy, well-ordered homes are a beneficial and cultural influence in a community; that they are an asset to the nation and that creating and maintaining them is an act of patriotism. (38)

Macbeth's discourse in this passage is characteristic of the intersection of nationalism and maternal feminism. From the viewpoint of nationalist antifeminists, Macbeth's espousal of the domestic science discourse, that is her espousal of a class-based maternal feminist discourse, justifies her appropriation of a position in the public arena. As Wilson and Frederiksen assert:

> The rise of nationalist ideologies can be associated with conservatism, especially with respect to the position of women....nationalist discourse has tended to remove

women from the public arena and emphasise an ideal of women's domesticity. (5) Many other women of Macbeth's and earlier periods operated in the public arena by positioning themselves at the intersection of maternal feminism and nationalism. In the following passage, Ada Mary Brown Courtice, Methodist, suffragist, School trustee, and founder of the Home and School Association, draws on the metaphor of the nation as a family's home to support her reform: "We must cultivate and elevate home-life if we would make our nation strong and secure, for as the home is so will the nation be" (Dehli 52). In the previously mentioned *Canadian Courier* article of 1913, C.C. Hamilton conflates Empire, race, and nation by arguing against the sixteen-hour day of the domestic worker:

> [A]re we doing our duty to the community or to our nation when we put such a strain on a young woman who may be a potential mother? Our duty to the race demands that we should govern the conditions of this young woman's work so that in later years she may have the chance of becoming the mother of a sound generation. (Hamilton 16)

Social Darwinism, classism, nationalism, and imperialism underlie concerns about the reproductive capabilities of the working-class English Canadian woman.

Although Macbeth's intervention in the area of domestic labour is feminist to the extent that she demands a higher social valuation of a devalued feminine sphere, her argument is intersected and compromised by discourses surrounding class and nationalism. Furthermore, Macbeth's argument was not new in 1944. Both the *Canadian Courier* and *Chatelaine* published articles on the "problem" of housework much earlier, in 1913 and 1928 respectively, and both magazines called for a rise in the social status of domestic workers.[83] The National Council of Women began lobbying in 1894 for domestic science classes in schools. Their expectations of the proposed educational reform were twofold: to construct Canadian wives and mothers according to Christian, English Canadian, middle class standards, and to produce better domestic workers for upper- and middle-class Canadian employers. The Council's initiative was supported by the Women's Christian Temperance Union and the Women's Institutes (Prentice 203-204). In addition to class and gender, the articulations of race and ethnicity are evident in the ways that Canadians managed the intersecting arenas of domestic service and domestic science. In "The Fractious Politics of a Settler Society: Canada," Daiva Stasiulis and Radha Jhappan point to the assumptions of white Canadian women in the period from 1880-1920: "As Canadian-born women came to shun the isolating and menial conditions of domestic service, ever-greater efforts were made to recruit immigrant and Native women to meet the unabating demand" (116).

A similar conjunction of race and class was addressed by Livesay in a 1947 article for the *Star Weekly*, "Canada's Japanese `Problem'." In this article, Livesay uncovers, in Stasiulis's and Jhappan's words, "how multi-layered and deeply rooted were the bases for racism against Asians" in Canada (116). "Economically, as long as the Japanese did work which would not otherwise be done by white people, there was little resentment," Livesay states in the article (4). The articulation of class, race, and wartime ideology resulted in the appropriation of Japanese-Canadians' homes, businesses, and voting rights by the provincial government, and in their forced diaspora which Livesay dramatized for radio in "Call My People Home" (1949). Her intellectual courage and independence of mind becomes clear in "Canada's Japanese `Problem'" for, in writing it, she treads a fine line between loyalty to the Canadian trade union movement, in this case the British Columbia Fishermen's and Allied Workers' Union, which excluded Japanese Canadian fishers, and her sense of justice. According to Livesay, other small business people of B.C. shared the white fishers' fear of being overwhelmed by the industrious Japanese, a racialized fear that first appeared in white Canadians' imperialist and racist responses to Eastern European immigrants in the 1890s and 1920s. In "Canada's Japanese `Problem'," Livesay explains this fear by turning to history, a materialist analytical approach which derives from her position in Canadian leftist politics. In "A Better Break for the Indian," published by the *Star Weekly* in October 1948, Livesay's Marxist background also surfaces through her emphasis on the "economic emancipation of the Indian" over education or health issues (2). In this article, Livesay warns against generalizing about Natives and calls for a revised, progressive Indian Act. The materialism of Livesay's articles for the *Star Weekly* is amenable with the *Star*'s roots: it was founded in 1892 by the striking printers of Toronto's *News*.[84]

In the years immediately following WWII, the *Star Weekly* also commissioned Livesay to write two other articles on issues of race, "Canada's East Indians" and "Canada's Partly Opened Door." In "Canada's Partly Opened Door" (August 2, 1947), Livesay criticizes the Immigration Act for being secretive, obscure and discriminatory. In 1946 and 1947, Canadian immigration regulations had been revised but were still selective. Canada was too slow to take its quota of refugees from Germany, writes Livesay, and Jewish applicants were discriminated against (3). She points out that in 1946 most immigrants to Canada were from Britain and, furthermore, that the Ontario government was giving "priority" to " "good Anglo-Saxon stock" " (3). The imperial discourse of the 1890s and 1920s persisted in the 1940s, as is clear in Livesay's quotation from the Ontario government: "`English, Scots and Irish,' the announcement said, `have always found a cordial and co-operative welcome (here) and always will'" (3). Chinese immigrants, on the other hand, bore the extraordinary measure of a head tax until 1924, and between 1924 and 1947, Canada banned the entry of Chinese immigrants entirely (Stasiulis and Jhappan 112). The immigration question illustrates "the Janus face of nationalism" in Canadian history, a face that exhibits opposing characteristics in one entity (Lerner 538, Nairn 32). As Adam J. Lerner argues, "the same concept [nationalism] serves to unify as well as exclude, liberate as well as oppress" (538). A selective immigration policy is exclusionary and the post WWII Canadian immigration policy was designed to serve and preserve hegemonic ethnic, race, and class interests. Livesay chose a position of critique in this arena; her work does not uphold the dominant ideology found in most discourses on Canadian immigration.

The fact that she sought out such controversial topics for her income-producing writing indicates her courage and her commitment to social justice, just as the publication of these feature articles in the *Star Weekly* indicates her professional status and the newspaper's commitment to investigative journalism. However, Livesay's writing reveals a belief that the assimilation of Asian Canadians into the Anglo-Saxon lifestyle, including adoption of the English language, would benefit them. In "Canada's Japanese 'Problem'," she blames Japanese Canadians' segregation on the fact that they were "cold-shouldered politically and socially" by white Canadians (4). "The result was inevitable," she writes. "Instead of becoming assimilated into Canadian life, they bought up property and businesses in segregated sections of the city" (4). In "Canada's East Indians," an article in which Livesay emphasizes the tradition of public service, democracy, and equality among B.C.'s Sikh population, she states that the 1947-enfranchisement of Asian Canadians "has meant that no longer will they live in segregated communities, clinging to their own way of dress, their own language and religious customs and their own diet" (7). Livesay's approval of assimilation of Asian Canadians rests on the assumption that a homogeneous culture is necessary to a strong nation state. In these four articles, Livesay consistently positions herself against racism but her anti-racism is mediated by approval of immigrants' assimilation into the English-language hegemony of Canada.

Nevertheless, Livesay's articles addressed systemic discrimination in a national newspaper. This act of exposure is remarkable in a period in which propaganda, such as Macbeth's anti-German rhetoric, was the norm. Nationalism becomes a nationwide self-defensive mechanism during periods of war, and Canadians reacted no differently during and after WWII. In retrospect, Livesay's pacifist leanings and reluctance to support the second world war resonate with her ambivalence on the question of patriotism during the twenties and thirties. Livesay's radical politics and internationalist worldview existed in an uneasy partnership with her views on nationalism and continentalism during these decades. In October 1929, Livesay published "John Brown's Body and the Canadian Civil War" in the University of Toronto's student magazine, *Privateer*. In this article, Livesay agrees with Leo Kennedy's opposition to Victorianism in Canadian poetry, but criticizes him for his "tendency to put another tradition in the place of Victorianism - Americanism" (12). However, only a few months later, in January of 1930, Livesay expresses continentalist sentiments in a letter to her father, J.F.B. Livesay. Livesay was studying French at Université Aix-Marseilles during the 1929-30 academic year, and her physical location may have influenced her viewpoint on Canada. She wrote from

L'Ensouleillado, Marseilles, in Provence:

> As I see it, a natural and geographic law binds us to the states; not to mention the bond of a mixed, transplanted race....[Canada] is too wide, with too many differences in each province, to be a whole, except as a part of the natural whole of North America. Patriotism is a very narrow thing.... (UM MSS37 Box 37 Fd 2)

At the turn of the decade of the 1920s, Livesay is struggling with the development of her position on nationalism and the writer's role in a nation state. Although she never advocated political unity between the United States and Canada, Livesay's letter reveals her participation in the continentalist discourse that was not only part of the North American milieu, but also part of the European perspective on North America, a perspective which erases differences between white North American nations. In contrast, Livesay's continentalism rests on the assumption that the differences which arise among peoples who inhabit one vast continent are the means of their unity. Livesay's membership in the Communist Party of Canada (CPC) from 1932 to 1939 supported any philosophical tendency she may have already developed in favour of continentalism. The CPC supported continentalism as an antidote to Canada's participation in the British Empire and membership in the Commonwealth. Operating under the assumption that the United States was not itself an imperial nation, the CPC hoped that a continental relationship between Canada and the U.S.A. would advance the international proletarian revolution. Livesay's espousal of this strategy appears in a newspaper report of a speech she gave to the Women's International League of Vancouver in 1936. According to the anonymous reporter for the *Vancouver Daily Province*, Livesay urged Canadian writers to "shake off tradition" and "imitate the modern works of the American writers" of social realism, so that Canadians could develop "a better understanding of the process of society" (*Right Hand Left Hand* 224).

Continentalism has different meanings for different peoples; it can be as simple as sense of commonality with other nations on the same continent or as complex as the belief that geographic unity inevitably leads to cultural, economic, and political unity. Many Canadians feared that a close relationship with the United States would develop into a political union of the two nations, and the subsequent disappearance of Canadian identity within the American melting pot. The Canadian imagist poet, W.W.E. Ross (1894-1966) took the continentalist-nationalist position; his continentalism was of the benign sort to which Livesay ascribes in her letter of 1929. Ross, who, according to David Arnason, was one of the first modernist poets in Canada, explains the 1920s relationship between continentalism and nationalism in an epigraph to his first volume of poetry, *Laconics* (Arnason 30). Ross writes:

> These pieces in
> a style more "North American"
> perhaps, or in
> a manner more "Canadian"
> than the most
> of what has been put down in verse
> in Canada,
> are not asserted to be so;
>
> But it is hoped
> that they will seemingly contain
> something of
> what quality may mark us off
> from older Europe,-
> something "North American"-
> and something of the sharper tang of Canada.
>
> (Arnason 30)

Ross's interest in differentiating Canada from both Europe and other North American nations is typical of Canadian cultural nationalism as practised 1920-1950.

Livesay's literary biographer, Lee Briscoe Thompson, suggests that Livesay practised literary nationalism in the 1960s. "Livesay became concerned to provide texts that would introduce to young Canadians their historical, literary, and ethical heritage," Thompson writes (66). In 1979, Livesay's own words indicate that she had moved to nationalism from continentalism. In an interview with Marsha Barber, she expresses her concern over the Americanization of Canada:

> we're still a colonial culture, and this affects the arts negatively. Anything we can do to defend ourselves against American culture must be done for the sake of being truly ourselves. All this talk about it being all right to bring in American culture as long as it's good is just nonsense. (Barber 29)

Through the phrase, "as long as it's good," Livesay refers obliquely to the debates over standards of judgment for literature, a conflict which I discuss in the following chapter.

Nationalism is an overdetermined discourse in the Canadian cultural field of 1920-1950. The relationship of literary nationalists to the field of power and to the nation state is mediated by discourses of imperialism, Eurocentrism, and continentalism, and by the factors of class, age, race, ethnicity, and gender. Livesay participated in these discourses through position-takings which varied during the twenties and thirties, a variation which may relate to her youth and the developmental character of her participation at that historical moment, that is, to her struggle with her own interpellation on several fronts. Macbeth's maturity, on the other hand, may account for the stability of her support of the hegemony through her practice of the ideologies of class, domestic science, imperialism, and war propaganda. However, age cannot account for the underlying reasons of positions, and Livesay's radical politics and anti-hegemonic choices provide a portrait of her worldview, just as Macbeth's discursive choices describe her more conservative world view. Macbeth's stand is much closer to the establishment than is Livesay's; that is, Macbeth's interpellated positions on issues related to political hegemonies change much less than Livesay's do. This observation does not mitigate the marginalization of both of these women writers within the Canadian literary field on the basis of gender, nor their relative powerlessness in all fields in which they operated.

In "`A New Soil and a Sharp Sun': the Landscape of a Modern Canadian Poetry," Sandra Djwa claims that "the new nationalism" had an "important" effect on Canadian modernist poets in the first half of this century (15). Here I have briefly and selectively examined the effects of nationalism on the thought, journalism, and self-positioning of several members of the Canadian literary field, Livesay and Macbeth among them. In the next chapter, I will explore the ways in which the thought and work of Livesay, Macbeth, and their contemporaries intersect with modernism and internationalism. I will outline the debates over the development of a Canadian literature and examine both nationalist and internationalist discourses on the question of a distinct national Canadian literature within the Anglo-American canon of literatures.

Chapter 4

Macbeth's Modernist Popular Literature and Livesay's Low Modernist Poetry: The Articulation of Modernism, Nationalism, and Internationalism in the Canadian Literary Field of 1920-1950

The world is my country
The human race is my race.
(F.R. Scott, *New Endeavour* xlvi)

On January 5, 1924, a New York publication, *The Literary Review*, published an article titled "Wanted - A Literature," by Constance Lindsay Skinner (1879-1939). *The Literary Review* was a supplement of the *New York Evening Post* (now the *New York Post*), which the *Review*'s editor, Henry Canby, describes as "a conservative radical" journal (*American Memoir* 269). Canby, a Professor of English and American literatures at Yale University, recalls in his memoir that he "never saw the leftists" in the office of *The Literary Review*, which was "owned by a banker" (315). Skinner was an expatriate Canadian who had been living in New York for seventeen years when "Wanted - A Literature" appeared. She was a professional writer who wrote modernist poetry, a New Woman who considered sexual politics in her poetry and fiction, and a historian who specialized in articles on the Pacific northwest.[85] Skinner's article was a review of the following three Canadian publications: *The Gaspards of Pine Croft* (1923) by Ralph Connor (Rev. Charles Gordon), *The Unheroic North* (1923) by Merrill Denison, and *The Witching of Elspie* (1923) by D.C. Scott. Skinner's review caused offence among cultural nationalists in Canada, because in it she claims that there is no literary writing on the Canadian northwest, aside from the first European explorers' own accounts. She writes, "Thompson's "narrative" is still by far the best literature on the Northwest, and Hearne's and Mackenzie's "journals" come next" (419). According to Skinner, the lack of literary writing on the Canadian northwest is due to the fact that "Best sellers" have misrepresented the historical facts and have created inaccurate legends about such groups as the "Royal Mounted" and the voyageurs (419). Skinner's review of all three Canadian publications is scathing. Connor's book does not differ from the many other melodramatic, adventure romances on the far north, she claims, and Scott's "volume of sketches rather than stories is also superficial, too reminiscent of other fiction" (419). Denison's "The Unheroic North," writes Skinner, "does not achieve irony; it only makes the effort obvious" (419).

Macbeth was outraged; she responded immediately and in writing. She wrote directly to Skinner and *The Literary Review*, and she also responded indirectly through public speeches, such as her 1924 speech to the London branch of the Canadian Women's Club, titled "Has Canada a Literature? Yes!". Macbeth was outraged more by Skinner's claim that Canadian literary writing did not exist than by Skinner's criticism of Connor, Denison, and Scott. Her outrage was seconded by Deacon, who supported Macbeth in the ensuing rhetorical skirmish between the two Canadian women writers. Other cultural producers also intervened; Denison wrote, in the voice of one of his characters, a wittily sarcastic letter to the editor of the *New York Evening Post*, a letter in which he skilfully lampoons Skinner's assumptions concerning continentalism and the allegedly derivative nature of Canadian literature.[86] Skinner's claims about the paucity and inferiority of Canadian literature and the public debate that ensued exemplify the tensions that circulated in Canada regarding nationalism, internationalism, modernism, and continentalism.

Contemporary literary criticism about the modernist period has misrepresented these tensions. In 1984, Ken Norris published *The Little Magazine in Canada 1925-1980* and, in 1989, Brian Trehearne published *Aestheticism and the Canadian Modernists*. In these studies, the authors perpetuate the myth of the thirty-year lag between the rise of Anglo-American and European modernisms, and the rise of Canadian modernism. Norris and Trehearne arrive at this questionable conclusion by several steps. First, they depend on the work of their precursors, literary critics Louis Dudek, Michael Gnarowski, and D.M.R. Bentley who, in turn, are indebted to E.K. Brown.[87] Second, they perform a series of exclusions which distort the history of the field: modernist prose, imagism, and the work of female Canadian modernist poets are not mentioned. Furthermore, they do not consider certain important factors impinging on the Canadian literary field of the period, such as Canada's cultural and political colonization. In short, Norris and Trehearne apply double standards and anachronistic methodology. Their allegiance, in the late twentieth century, to the myth surrounding the late arrival of modernist writing to Canada extends Skinner's opinion concerning the underdevelopment of literary writing in Canada during the early decades of the twentieth century. I will return to the particulars of these two events later, but, first, I want to explain my view of the relationship between the terms that I have introduced in this chapter's title: modernism and internationalism.

Modernism as an International Masculinist Cultural Movement

Bridget Elliott and Jo-Ann Wallace define modernism as "a discursive and historical *field*," and "a cultural field, one which must be further understood as the evolving product of a continuing struggle for certain kinds of symbolic power," definitions which are well suited to my purposes because they acknowledge the diversity and competition within literary fields (1, 2). Modernism is a diversified cultural movement which crosses disciplines, genres, and media, and internationalism is both a characteristic of modernism in the cultural field, and an independent factor in other fields, such as the political and economic fields. Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane claim that "the essence of Modernism is its international character," and they point out that "one critic, indeed, has argued that `Modernism, in short, is synonymous with internationalism'" (31).[88] Internationalism is a worldview which focuses on relations between nations, rather than on concerns within each nation.[89] Internationalists claim to be cosmopolitan, or citizens of the world, with no specific ties to one nation or group. Cosmopolitanism is sometimes used as a synonym for internationalism, but it refers to the urban tendency of modernism. Literary critic and writer David Arnason defines literary cosmopolitanism in opposition to nationalism. "The cosmopolitan attitude [to literature] sees Canada as part of a larger English-speaking culture with capitals in London and New York," he writes, "and regards any attempt to define Canada separately as narrow and insular" (28).

In this project, I use internationalism in both its senses: as an aspect of modernist literary and aesthetic developments, especially in relation to literary standards, and as a factor in political and economic developments. The fields of politics, economics, and culture operate relationally, and the usefulness of the term international in all three fields indicates that issues and concerns overlap the arbitrary boundaries of fields. For instance, technological, scientific, social, and political developments of the 1875-1950 period had varying repercussions in all disciplines. The internationalist policy that motivated the formation of the League of Nations after WWI is just as much a part of modernity as is the transition from Victorianism to modernism in poetry. I argue that the international dominance of the English language in political and economic fields, that is in fields of power, a hegemony achieved through the spread of imperialist and capitalist systems, underlies the development of the Western cultural belief in universal standards of literary quality.

Internationalism, modernism, and cosmopolitanism flourished during the period of modernity, a historical period the exact dating of which is contested. "Historian of modern design" Penny Sparke defines modernity as "a particular historical moment and a set of experiences," and modernism as "a high cultural response to those experiences" (12, 76). Depending on the discipline being discussed, historians date modernity from 1890-1940, 1890-1930, 1850-1975, 1880-1950 or 1910-1930.[90] Various factors have been proposed by cultural historians as major contributors to the rise of modernism around the turn of the twentieth century. The high level of innovative technological activity and social upheaval contributed to a faster pace of life and a sense of fragmentation. Feminist literary critic Gabriele Griffin states that the rise of the phenomenon of the expatriate writer during modernity "was one major contributing factor to the internationalism of modernism" (7). Marxist cultural historian Andreas Huyssen claims that "it was the ever increasing pace of commodification and colonization of cultural space which actually propelled modernism forward" (57).[91] The concepts of the literary movement and the literary generation are useful for understanding the diversity of modernism. Modernism as a movement, marked by difference according to discipline and location, provides an overall structural distinction between modernism and its precursors, the Victorian and Romantic movements. In Canada, the Victorian-Modernist dichotomy is particularly active in the genre of poetry. Arnason uses the term modernism to distinguish between "conventional nineteenth-century poetic structure," that is Victorianism, and the free verse of the twentieth century ("Dorothy Livesay" 6). In Chapter 5, I develop my earlier delineation of three literary generations amongst Canadian modernist poets, as an aid to understanding the permutations of modernism within the Canadian literary field.

As Bradbury and McFarlane repeatedly assert, modernism developed in various time periods and in various ways in various countries. There is no singular, totalizing, universal modernism. The Anglo-American view of the history of modernism attributes the origins of modernism to Gustave Flaubert and Charles Baudelaire in nineteenth-century France, from where it moved to England and the United States; in this historical narrative, modernism occurs 1900-1925 (Bradbury 36). However, Bradbury's and McFarlane's research on the literary histories of Austria, Germany, and the Scandinavian region reveals that these European nations developed their own modernisms one generation before France, England, and the U.S.A. (Bradbury 37). Such factual contradictions provide the background for my scepticism concerning the thirty-year-lag proposition that is so popular among Canadian literary critics. As Bradbury and McFarlane point out, "Indeed Modernism can look surprisingly different depending on where one finds the centre, in which capital (or province) one happens to stand" (30).

My claim that Canadian modernism holds a historically-specific position among other modernisms is not new. In 1977, Sandra Djwa wrote:

> Because our post-war cultural climate was quite different from that of the United States and Great Britain, Canadians developed a basically optimistic view of the land. The resonant image of the Twenties was "The Solemn Land," "The Lonely Land," the northern land, but not *The Wasteland*. Critical comments that Canadians did not produce poems analogous to "Prufrock" or "Mauberley" and hence a version of English and American modernism, do little to illuminate the development of modern poetry in Canada. (16)

The Canadian poets F.R. Scott and A.J.M. Smith were introduced to modernism through the work of English-speaking poets in the U.K., such as W.B. Yeats and T.S. Eliot. This introduction occurred in the 1910s and 1920s partly through the British post-secondary educations of these Canadian modernists, and partly through British and American publications, such as *Poetry* (Chicago), which were read by Canadian writers. *Poetry* (Chicago) was an influential little magazine through which Anglo-American modernism developed. Livesay's exposure to modernist poetry at an early age through her family's subscription to *Poetry* (Chicago) had such a tremendous influence on her that she began writing in free verse rather than in traditional forms or Victorian diction. Between 1926 and 1928, Livesay wrote the Imagist nature poems in *Green Pitcher* (1928). The melancholy tone characteristic of much ***haiku*** poetry also appears in some of Livesay's Imagist poetry, such as the following, titled "Reality":

> Encased in the hard, bright shell of my dream,
> How sudden now to wake
> And find the night still passing overhead,
> The wind still crying in the naked trees,
> Myself alone, within a narrow bed.
>
> (*Green Pitcher* 6

Livesay's next volume of Imagist poetry, *Signpost*, appeared in 1932. In the post-1932 period, Livesay's attention turned from nature and the home to social criticism and factory work. She discovered the low modernist work of C. Day-Lewis, Stephen Spender, and W.H. Auden in a Greenwich Village bookstore in the winter of 1934/35. Upon reading the British low modernists, Livesay rejected Eliot's high modernism for its "pessimism" (*The Documentaries* 17). Her criticism is based on political differences which underlie the high/low binary used by literary critics, including myself, to distinguish among types of modernism. High modernism is introspective, intertextual, intellectual, apolitical, and concerned with formal innovation. Arnason describes high modernism as "the addition of a philosophic base to the methods of modernism as developed by the Imagists" ("Dorothy Livesay" 16-17). Bradbury and McFarlane define high modernism as "high aesthetic self-consciousness and non-representationalism, in which art turns from realism and humanistic representation towards style, technique, and spatial form" (25). Low modernism, on the other hand, combines modernist literary form with political content. Low modernist poets engage with society by addressing issues of class and race, by criticizing war, or by invoking the effects of industrialization on society, as Livesay does in "Day and Night" and Louis MacNeice does in "Passage Steamer."

But Canadian literary modernism appeared much earlier than Livesay's Imagist publications. Arthur Stringer and Frank Oliver Call published free verse and modernist manifestos in the first two decades of the twentieth century, concurrent with the developments of Hulme's and Ezra Pound's theories of Imagism in England.[92] Louise Morey Bowman's modernist poems were published in Harriet Monroe's magazine, *Poetry* (Chicago), in 1918, and the work of Florence Livesay appeared in *Poetry* (Chicago) three years earlier. Skinner's prize-winning modernist poetry was published by the same journal in 1914. Skinner's poems about west coast Native Canadians, and Florence Livesay's renditions of Ukrainian folksongs, tales, and poetry are modernist by virtue of their internationalism and use of free verse. Concerning Florence Livesay's translations, Arnason writes: "The poems are a good deal more than translations.... Florence Randal Livesay was a follower of the new movements in poetry, and she chose modern forms for her loosely rendered translations" ("Dorothy Livesay and the Rise of Modernism in Canada" 8). Radical formal innovations, characteristic of high modernist poetry, were being made in Canada; Lawren Harris's volume *Contrasts* is a good example. "The Evangelist," first published in *Contrasts* in 1922, is a series of masculine urban images; its radical form is remarkably modern. Arnason calls Harris "Canada's first urban poet," and claims that "The Evangelist" is forty years ahead of its time ("Canadian Poetry: the Interregnum" 29-30). During the first quarter of this century, modernist writers were in the minority internationally, not just in Canada.

Canadian modernism was practised more and more widely as the twentieth century progressed. In the field of radio drama, Livesay tried to expand the boundaries of acceptable form, and met resistance from established CBC drama producers, such as Andrew Allan. In the subfield of journalism, *The Canadian Forum*, *Masses*, and *New Frontier*, all of which published Livesay's and others' modernist writing, were produced with a modernist attention to layout and illustrations, an attention which derives, according to Djwa, from the close relationship between Canadian modernist writers and painters (5-6). In the subfield of fiction, Irene Baird wrote *Waste Heritage* (1936) in a poetic prose style that is both arresting in its modernism and similar to reportage, the innovative form of journalism adopted by leftist writers such as Livesay. According to critic Roger Leslie Hyman, *Waste Heritage* is less didactic, more "sophisticated," more gender inclusive, and "more mature" than is Steinbeck's *In Dubious Battle*, an American novel on a similar topic. Hyman states:

> The sense of hopelessness and frustration is far better revealed in Baird's novel, and in many ways *Waste Heritage* is a more ambitious effort. The settings are not as restricted, and Baird deals not only with radical activity and 'practical' communism, but with the very flavour and feel of the human implications of the Depression. (76)

Nevertheless, Steinbeck's novel had been reprinted seventeen times by 1981, whereas Baird's work, like Macbeth's, is out of print, a fact that testifies not only to the differing literary markets in the United States and Canada, but also to the masculinization of the canon and to publishers' dependence on and perpetuation of that construction.

In addition to Canada's differing position in the global field of modernism, I want to address differences within modernism on the basis of gender. Although feminist literary critic Marianne DeKoven sees gender as an instrumental factor in the creation of differing modernisms, she maintains that "some aspects of modernist *form* common to all (or most) works we would consider modernist - the invention of which we are accustomed to crediting to James, Yeats, Conrad, Pound, Joyce - were just as much birthed by female writers as they were invented by male writers" (19). In "Gendering Modernism: H.D., Imagism, and Masculinist Aesthetics," Michael Kaufmann claims that both Hilda Doolittle and Amy Lowell participated in masculine modernism, but in differing ways. H.D., according to Kaufmann, developed masculinist literary forms in her imagist poems through her erasure of the authorial voice, that is, through her work's "impersonality," while Lowell's criticism of the feminine content in H.D.'s imagist poems, a criticism that was based on misinterpretation according to Kaufmann, marks Lowell as a proponent of the anti-feminine bias in modernism (62, 67). In Chapter 5, I argue that the exclusion of Livesay's modernist poetry from *New Provinces* (1936) is one example among many of systemic exclusionary practices on the basis of gender in the Canadian literary field. However, I also share Maria DiBattista's scepticism about the place of theories of exclusion in theories of modernism, a scepticism she expresses in the introduction to *High and Low Moderns: Literature and Culture, 1889-1939* (18). As DiBattista points out, the extremities of the low/high binary do not do justice to the permutations of modernism as they operated in conditions of modernity. Since even a continuum is framed by opposites, perhaps the metaphor of a soup of low, high, and other modernisms would more closely represent the variety of positions available to and taken by agents in the cultural and literary fields during modernity. Moreover, the soup metaphor contests the devaluation of the feminine on which the binaries of low/high modernism and popular-literature/literary-writing are based.

The plethora of characteristics that have been applied to modernism suggests that no single writer, region, race, sex, or nation could fulfil all of the expectations attached to the following identifiers: scientific, intellectual, experimental, fragmented, objective, anonymous, efficient, individualistic, dislocated, internationalist, non-decorative, functionalist, urban, masculine, sexually liberated. All or some of these descriptors are used by cross disciplinary theorists in their discussions of modernism. As this project is not devoted to a study of modernism, I will not attempt to address the ways in which each characteristic in the above list does or does not manifest itself in the writing of Livesay and Macbeth. As far as the global modernist movement is concerned, I am most interested in its masculinization. Sparke explains that European modernist architects such as Le Corbusier and Adolf Loos hated the tradition of feminine interior decoration that was popular with the Victorian bourgeoisie (104). In the Victorian tradition, the home was a site of display as well as a refuge from the masculine public sphere. Sparke argues that the gendered division of labour which was introduced by the industrial revolution led to distinctly feminine and masculine approaches to design (105). Feminine interior design of the nineteenth century derived from middle- and upper-class women's gendered interest in personal adornment and fashion, which was a "marker of social positioning" (Sparke 115). On the other hand, modernist interior design of the early twentieth century was designed specifically for the urban environment and its orderly grid of streets and avenues, its open spaces, and the preponderance of hard concrete over soft fabric. In opposition to feminine design, Le Corbusier, Loos, and the German Bauhaus school of design introduced functionalism to designs of buildings, houses, furniture, and appliances; functionalism, a modernist style, is characterized by "geometry, objectivity" and simplicity (Sparke 113). In literature, the modernist model of scientific objectivity translates into the following masculinized elements, among others: experimentation in form, conciseness in diction, hardness or cleanliness of description, and a focus on urban concerns. In Canada, the literary equivalent of the modernist designers' emphasis on lack of ornamentation is evident in modernist poets' rejection of Victorian diction and themes, especially in the work of poets who were labelled as maple tree or nature poets. This Canadian enactment of symbolic violence, which is based on the devaluation of the feminine, is a major thread in the narrative of Canadian literary history. For instance, in 1945, *Northern Review* published an editorial which positions this modernist journal as simultaneously anti-feminine, anti-Victorian, anti-popular literature, and nationalist (Norris 44-45).

Besides being gendered masculine, high modernism is often regarded as elitist, especially by leftists such as Livesay and Kennedy. In a 1936 radio lecture, Livesay described Eliot's poetry as elitist (*Right Hand Left Hand* 63). Sparke claims that modernist design, urban planning, and mass production were expected to break down class barriers and produce a democratic classless, consumer society (101). However, most consuming was performed by those in the upper social echelons, while lower-class citizens merely aspired to a more ostentatious level of consumption. The mid-nineteenth-century French writer, Baudelaire, extolled the culture of display practised by the Parisian upper class, a display which he saw as a rich resource for the modernist artist (Wolff 39). In 1928, A.J.M Smith wrote from a similar elitist position when he criticized the Canadian reader for a lack of understanding of irony and cynicism in (high) modernist literature ("Wanted-

Canadian Criticism" 601). Canadian writers, he claims, "find themselves in an atmosphere of materialism that is only too ready to seduce them from their allegiance to art, and with an audience that only wishes to be flattered" (600). In "Wanted-Canadian Criticism," Smith sets up dichotomies between the masses of Canadian readers and the modernist writer, between "poor canadian [and] good foreign books," and between popular literature and artistic writing (600). Similarly, in "Wanted-A Literature," Skinner elevates art above imitation and criticizes "[b]est sellers" for "libel[ing] everything northwest of the great lakes" (419). Twenty-five years later, in a 1949 letter to *Saturday Night* magazine, Livesay perpetuates the popular-artistic dichotomy by describing modernist writers as "serious writers" who are concerned with "their craft" and popular writers as "commercial writers ...of innocuous best-sellers" who are more concerned with "the trade" than with the production of literature (UA #96-69 Box 2, File 25). Canadian modernists such as Smith, Skinner, and Livesay competed with nonmodernists in the literary field on two fronts, those of the movement and the genre. They opposed both their immediate poetic precursors, the Victorians, as well as all writers of popular literature. Hierarchical divisions, such as the one that Smith marks "between commerce and art," Skinner marks between "best sellers" and "art," and Livesay marks between "trade" and "craft," are intrinsic to both the popular-literature/literary-writing continuum and to the high/low modernist binary (600; 419; File 25).

The proliferation of descriptors applied to modernist cultural production (fragmented, masculine, experimental, etc.) supports, in my view, the claim that the modernist movement is fraught with difference. Modernism might be better viewed as a conglomeration or field of positions in which terms such as conservative or radical constitute two positions among many. In this project, I use a broad definition of modernism: any literary work that exhibits one aspect of modernism deserves consideration under that label. For instance, Imagism, based on a British poet's experience with the western Canadian landscape in 1906, is part of my definition of modernism. Bradbury and McFarlane include Imagism as one of several sub-movements within the modernist movement (23). In "A Lecture on Modern Poetry," the founder of Imagism, T.E. Hulme, writes: "The first time I ever felt the necessity or inevitableness of verse was in the desire to reproduce the peculiar quality of feeling which is induced by the flat spaces and wide horizons of the virgin prairie of Western Canada" (Hulme in Djwa 7). Upon his return to Britain, Hulme worked on developing the Imagist method, and he drew on Japanese *haiku* poetics; in addition to its focus on non-subjective description, the international influences that contribute to Imagism justify its inclusion within modernism. Bradbury and McFarlane call Imagism a sub-movement within the modernist movement, but other critics do not include Imagism within their definitions of modernism (23). Natan Zach indicates the range of critical attitudes to Imagism when he explains that Imagism has been described both as "the centre of a `revolution in the literature of the English language as momentous as the Romantic one,'" and "as no more than one of Pound's `illusions'" (228-229). Kaufmann describes Imagism as "the first Modernist poetry," and ascribes to Imagism the modernist opposition to Victorian diction, an opposition which was central to Canadian modernism (60). On the other hand, Trehearne calls Imagism a "Modernist pre-school" (40).

Systemic patterns of discrimination on the basis of the sex/gender system underlie the exclusion of Imagism from modernism by some writers and commentators. According to Kaufmann, Lowell criticized H.D.'s Imagist poetry not only for its feminine content, but also for its lyric form, a form that was perceived to be feminine (67). Elliott and Wallace cite the rivalry between Pound and Lowell as an important factor in Pound's devaluation of the Imagist movement after Lowell became its leader. "Ezra Pound's disparaging comments about the decline of Imagism into 'Amygism,'" they write, "...suggest that the inclusion (or worse, predominance) of women writers in such ventures as Imagist group publishing meant the sure decline of the movement or the association" (69). Such a feminization and decline dogged the Canadian Authors Association (CAA) from its inception. The organization's publication of members' work in *Poetry Year Books*, the dissemination of advice on the literary marketplace, the large number of female members, and the tendency towards Victorian style and diction: all raised the antagonism of modernists in the next literary generation.

Livesay's Low Modernist Poetry.

In addition to the sexual politics of exclusion, and the sexual politics addressed by fiction such as *Shackles*, *Purple Springs*, and *Wild Geese*, the Canadian modernist literary movement was fractured by the politics of political parties. The perception of modernist literature as individualistic, upper-class, and intellectual led radical Canadians such as the members of the Communist Party of Canada (CPC) to reject high modernism. This style of literature was seen to be of little use to the activist who wanted to communicate with the masses and thereby initiate an international revolution of the proletariat. The far left's rejection of modernism, the most radical form of writing available to writers of the day, may seem ironic, but it demonstrates one effect that political factors can have on the literary position-taking of writers. I argued in Chapter 1 that content and collectivity counted more to communists of the period than did radical developments of literary form. As a modernist, Livesay was in an impossible conflict when she was involved with the CPC between 1932 and 1939.[93] She temporarily resolved this contradiction by writing non-modernist proletarian literature for about four years, 1932-1936. Mass chants, one act plays, short stories, reportage, and traditional forms of poetry (albeit with radical content) constitute most of her output during this hiatus from modernism.

Livesay's response to the conflict between red politics and high modernist poetics was to develop a new style of Canadian poetry, one that combined modernist form with socially critical, pro-proletarian, Marxist content. Arnason has called this style low modernism. In "Dorothy Livesay and the Rise of Modernism in Canada," Arnason asserts that Livesay "rejected one of its [modernism's] manifestations, high modernism, but was clearly a pioneer in exploring the possibilities of modernistic poetic techniques to express a more humane and democratic vision" (17). In 1935, Livesay gave up her employment as a social worker in New Jersey for health reasons; she returned to Canada in a state of depression, "supposedly with an ulcer but actually, I think with a slight nervous breakdown" (*Right Hand Left Hand* 153). "Day and Night," written during her recuperation at the Livesay family's country home, was the first low modernist poem which she published. In January 1936, it appeared in the first issue of *Canadian Poetry*

Magazine, a new publication founded by the CAA, and edited by Pratt, who was determined to publish both the Victorian verse that was written by most members of the CAA, as well as modernist poems. Pratt was a transitional figure of the period; like Florence Livesay, he is part of the Victorian artistic generation but, according to Arnason, he adopted modernist form in his later poetry (13).

"Day and Night" is low modernist in both form and content. The poem describes work in a steel factory; just as a focus on the city is inherent to high modernism, a focus on urban industrial working conditions is inherent to both low modernism and to the internationalism of the CPC. Part four of the six-part poem is written in the voice of a white steel worker whose black colleague faces racism on the job. Issues of race were theoretically important to the left because a lack of unity resulting from racial tensions within the working class could threaten the worldwide proletarian revolution that communists hoped was imminent.[94] In part five, the speaker of the poem calls the workers to action:

> But listen, friend:
> We are mightier
> In the end.
>
> We have ears
> Alert to seize
> A weakness
> In the foreman's ease
>
> We have eyes
> To look across
> The bosses' profit
> At our loss.
>
> Are you waiting?

Wait with us
After evening
There's a hush -

Use it not
For love's slow count:
Add up hate
And let it mount

Until the lifeline
Of your hand
Is calloused with
A fiery brand!

Add up hunger,
Labor's ache
These are figures
That will make

The page grow crazy
Wheels go still,
Silence sprawling
On the till -

Add your hunger,
Brawn and bones,
Take your earnings:
Bread, not stones!

(*The Documentaries* 21, 22).

The staccato rhythm of these hortatory phrases creates a sense of urgency. Critic Robin Endres interprets Livesay's choice of short lines as a structural device designed to mimic the mechanical nature of automated manufacturing practices (104). Elsewhere in "Day and Night," Livesay uses the high modernist strategies of irony and minimal use of rhyme. Moreover, continentalist sympathies are evident in the adoption of the American spelling of labour, which appears in the original manuscript of 1935 and continues through two publications until 1972 when McGraw-Hill Ryerson published the poem in Livesay's *Collected Poems: The Two Seasons.*[95]

As a modernist poet, Livesay was isolated within the anti-modernist atmosphere of both the American and Canadian communist parties. On discovering the "revolutionary poetry" of Spender, Day- Lewis, and Auden, Livesay comments: "I think I must have wept over this discovery, but there was no [sic] one of my friends and comrades who would have taken any interest in it" (*Right Hand Left Hand* 153). From February 1932 to April 1934, all of Livesay's writing was produced for the Canadian Marxist magazine *Masses*, which ceased publication in April 1934. Livesay published in *The Canadian Forum* and *Canadian Poetry Magazine* for a few months during 1936 until she, Kennedy, and White left to institute *New Frontier*. In an acrimonious *New Frontier* article of 1936, "Direction for Canadian Poets," Kennedy states that Pratt's *Canadian Poetry Magazine* was "full of sop," except for Livesay's "Day and Night," and Nathaniel Benson's "Depression Chants" (14). Kennedy claims that "the function of poetry is to interpret the contemporary scene faithfully; *to interpret especially the progressive forces in modern life which alone stand for cultural survival*" (emphasis in original 12). He castigates pre-modernist Canadian poetry for its "antedeluvian [sic] formulae," "placid flatness," immaturity, "avoidance of self-criticism," and superficiality. Kennedy's caustic remarks are also aimed at his contemporaries, Smith, Finch, Klein, Audrey Alexander Brown, Charles Bruce, and Pratt, all of whom, he claims, imitate the "neo-metaphysical verse" of T.S. Eliot and fail to "[shake] themselves free of the superseded traditions," as have Livesay and Scott (16). Of Smith, Kennedy writes, "Yet the snobbery and obscurity of his work has for years restricted him to publication in those journals which hold sternly to aesthetics come hell and high water [sic]" (16-17). Kennedy also criticizes the poems in his own volume, *The Shrouding* (1933), as "entirely subjective and lack[ing] contact with the larger reality" (17). By including himself in this group of neo-metaphysicals, Kennedy adopts a rhetorical strategy that is the literary equivalent of the verbal public confessions which were practised by Maoist communists. Kennedy's article indicates a rift within Canadian modernism, a division based upon political beliefs and upon differences between high and low modernism. As Arnason explains, "High modernism is essentially a self-referential, rather than an externally referential, poetry" ("Dorothy Livesay" 17). High modernism derives from liberal philosophies of the individual which underlie capitalist economic systems, whereas low modernism favours the community over the individual and socialism over capitalism.

All modernists rebelled against traditional forms of writing but only low modernists or modernist socialists, such as Kennedy, Livesay, and Scott, brought overt references to politics into the field of literature. Although high modernist poetry claims to be apolitical, support for the political-economic hegemony is implicit in apolitical stances. Low modernist radicals wanted to utilize and develop modernist forms in literature at the same time as addressing proletarian concerns. Abstract subject matter was taboo to the socialist modernist who expected the audience to include working-class readers. For these writers, issues of class, race, income, and education intersected with literary questions. The characteristics of low and high modernism articulate differently with the various genres on the popular-literature/pure-art continuum. Popular literature writers and radical left activists concurred in their disdain for abstract, intellectual art because both groups were concerned about maintaining the interest of the under-educated reader. At the same time, the radical politics of the CPC were strongly opposed to the generally conservative politics of the field of popular literature, a field that consisted, in 1920-1950, of people in a wide range of political and cultural positions, such as British-Canadian imperial federationists and 'pink' reformers (social gospellers and other Christians). In "Direction for Canadian Poets," Kennedy implicitly accuses high modernists of maintaining the traditional, apolitical subjects of "Beauty, Life, Time, Love, Faith-hopeandcharity" that characterized Victorian poetry and the territory of pure art (13). Arnason's description of high modernism clearly reveals the reasons that radicals like Kennedy would damn non-materialist or high modernist poetry. "High modernism is aristocratic in its appeal," Arnason writes. "It favours intellectual toughness, and deliberately chooses obscure references and metaphysical conceits, and without apology, speaks in several languages sequentially" ("Dorothy Livesay" 17). If we assume that low modernism is low because it is `infected' by tendencies to the popular, then Livesay's, Scott's, and Kennedy's political-modernist poetry of the thirties is located at the boundary between popular literature and pure art, creating a marginal area that implicitly questions the class, values, and content of high modernist writing. This is the position implied by Kennedy when he equates "snobbery and obscurity" with "aesthetics" in his essay (16-17).

Macbeth's Modernist Popular Literature: *Shackles* (1926).

Throughout her career, Macbeth supported writers' freedom to discuss sexuality in literature, a claim which is part of the agenda adhered to by most modernists. When she published "How Much Sex Should Be Put in Novels?" in the March 22, 1947 edition of *Saturday Night* magazine, Macbeth was effectively positioning herself within the modernist subfield, in which she had already practised for twenty years. In "How Much Sex Should Be Put in Novels?," Macbeth recounts a conversation she had with a "reformer" who criticized modern literature as pornographic (23). She writes:

> Hesitantly I began my support of modern literature. Fanatics are difficult to touch save in agreement with their theories. Too many of them read a book determined to find so much "dirt, over-frankness or realism that it should never have been written." Too often they overlook the fine quality, the underlying sincerity that makes for *true art*. (emphasis added 23)

Macbeth adds, "if books do not reflect the conditions in which they are written, they are not a form of art, but of artificiality" (23). She admits that some writers exploit sex as a means of selling their work; however, she "deplores this fact deeply" and states, "I also deplore the fact that with self-righteous smugness other writers skip every incident in married life between the altar and the first christening. Sex relations between men and women are natural and need not be ignored or offensive" (23).

In the 1920s, Canadian modernists differentiated themselves from the Victorian literary movement by calling for more frequent and open treatment of human sexuality in literature, and Macbeth was in the vanguard of this practice. In "Wanted-Canadian Criticism," Smith applied modernists' demand for sexual openness in literature to Canadian literature:

> Nowhere is puritanism more disastrously prohibitive than among us, and it seems, indeed, that desperate methods and dangerous remedies must be resorted to, that our condition will not improve until we have been thoroughly shocked by the appearance in our midst of a work of art that is at once successful and obscene. (600-601)

Such a work had already appeared, but Smith had not read it. Macbeth's novel *Shackles* (1926) deals frankly with adult sexual activity; for example, it addresses the issue of rape within marriage, an issue which was taboo before and for several decades after the publication of the novel. Smith's failure to cite *Shackles* as that "successful and obscene...work of art" which he hoped to read points to his self-positioning in the literary writing arena of the Canadian literary field. First, he ignored the field of popular literature and was unaware of developments in the genre of the novel in Canada during the 1920s; his early critical work was entirely concerned with poetry. Second, he disregarded literature by women, especially by women who wrote for the large- scale field of production as Macbeth did. However, Macbeth's modernist content was not overlooked by all of her contemporaries in the Canadian literary field. In the twenties, H. Napier Moore, editor of *Maclean's Magazine* from 1926 to 1954, rejected two of Macbeth's short stories for their modern approach to separation and divorce and, during their correspondence over Skinner's review, Deacon described Macbeth as a "literary artist" (NAC MG30 D52 Vol.4 File 1932 Items 1925, 1928 n.d.; Vol.2 Correspondence 1924 Item 986).

Besides its consideration of sexual politics, *Shackles* exhibits other modernist tendencies. It is intellectual; the pros and cons of feminism are argued through the characters' conversations. All the main characters place art on a pedestal, above material reality. For instance, *Shackles*' anti-hero, Arnold, has a hierarchical attitude towards art, an attitude which resembles the romantic tendency of high modernism. Macbeth writes, "He worshipped Beauty as he worshipped God. Both, to him, were sacred. But both must be kept apart from intimate contact, divorced from all reality, otherwise they would not remain pure and unsullied" (175). Moreover, *Shackles* is a work of psychological realism in which the narrator explores the conflict between the characters' thoughts and actions. The introduction of Freud's psychoanalytic method to both intellectual and popular discourse at the turn of the century was a factor in the development of modernist prose writing. Macbeth believed that "A truly great novel must concern itself primarily with the action of the mind" ("Novelists...What Now?" 4).

In *Shackles*, Macbeth analyzes the position of a creative woman, Naomi, within a traditional marriage. Besides trivializing her writing, Naomi's husband, Arnold, assumes that their marriage gives him sexual access to her body at any time. *Shackles* is a radical work because it attacks the institution of marriage. Naomi perceives herself and her lover, Hugo Main, as "offering a challenge to one of the most unsuccessful institutions in life" through their quest for an egalitarian union (251). Furthermore, *Shackles* is radical because the heroine contests not only the sexual division of labour within marriage but also the power imbalance within sexual relations. She finds both her husband and her lover to be sexually aggressive and demanding. After a dinner party given by Shireen, who represents the successful New Woman, Naomi argues with Hugo over power in heterosexual relationships:

> "Love should mean fifty-fifty," said Naomi, more gently. "Can you not understand that just as my unresponsiveness is a trial to you, your *demand* is a strain upon me? Can you not see that it is identical with forcing myself to eat when I am not hungry, or to walk when I would rather rest?" (emphasis in original 282)

To differentiate among the choices available to white, western women who are involved in private power struggles such as this one, Macbeth draws on the stereotypes of the Madonna and the whore, a binary which, according to literary critic Shirley Peterson, "underlies the competing discourses of female sexual liberation" (108). Naomi represents the angel in the house, the decent woman who never initiates sex, whereas Hester, a hypocritical, Christian, evangelizing divorcee who seduces Arnold, represents the deviant, sexually aggressive woman. Naomi remains with Arnold not only because she can see no advantage in leaving him for Hugo, but also because Arnold needs her and puts her on a pedestal. In the penultimate scene of the novel, Arnold tells Naomi, "We are all alike, we men. To hold us, our women must be pure" (321). Arnold castigates himself for his affair with Hester and declares his admiration for his wife. Naomi pities her husband and tries to talk herself out of that feeling: "`Be strong,' she kept commanding herself. `This is only sentimental maternalism, an emotional outbreak of thwarted motherhood'" (322). Naomi is torn between her interpellation by, and her desire to break free from, traditional gender roles. She recognizes that her decision to remain in the locus of oppression, her marriage, fulfils societal expectations of the wife's role as asexual nurturer. Although Naomi sees nothing in her marriage but a struggle for her right to pursue the vocation of letters, she remains with Arnold from a combination of two fears: fear that Hugo would eventually abandon her, as Arnold abandoned the sexually active Hester, and fear of the inevitable social censure that would follow the abandonment of her husband. In "Gendered Doubleness and the `Origins' of Modernist Form," DeKoven argues that *The Awakening* (1899) "is a characteristic work of early modernist fiction by women" because its author Kate Chopin "was just as afraid of liberation as she was eager for it" (28). In addition to marking *Shackles* as a maternal feminist text, the unexpected climax enacts a similar ambivalence: Naomi chooses a conventional lifestyle within which she will negotiate a space for her independence. Notably, the narrative concludes with Naomi being interrupted by Arnold as she writes in a room of her own.

Shackles combines both radical and traditional elements. Its narrative closely follows those arguments over suffrage and female emancipation that were part of the popular discourse during the 1910s. Peterson's description of Rebecca West's feminist novel *The Judge* as "part psychological drama, and part feminist polemic," also describes *Shackles* (107). At the same time, however, the ideals of the angel in the house and of a naturalized maternal instinct are highly valued by many of Macbeth's characters. *Shackles* represents the articulation of the New Woman philosophy with maternal feminism, an articulation for which I argued in the introduction to this project. In Arnold's anti-feminist discourse we see an example of the opposition which drove early feminists to moderate the radical principles of New Womanhood. Claiming that "women who write...have gone mad over this idea of independence," Arnold states: "Personally, I cannot believe that, in her heart, any true and upright woman wishes to be exempt from a life of Christian service to her fellow beings" (189). In fact, this principle proves to be active in Naomi who, although she understands that "You can't take all humanity to your breast and give it comfort," chooses caregiving over autonomy (322). Naomi's conventionality is an important factor in her decision to remain with Arnold; she cannot fully live her feminist principles because she fears social censure. Macbeth describes Naomi's conventionality or lack of courage as "instinct," an essentialist description because it names a cultural construction as a biological instinct (263). In discussing her marital dilemma with Shireen, Naomi says, "I'm always fighting - intelligence against instinct. And instinct wins - wins - wins! It's that damnable old woman-thing...the desire for respectability as it is translated by the masses, the dread of censure, the shrinking from disagreeable prominence" (263). Noami's words indicate the articulation of middle-class values and feminine essentialism, the latter based on the alleged prominence of reproduction in the lives of all women, a prominence to which maternal feminists subscribed. Macbeth symmetrically pairs this essentialism with a description of men's allegedly innate need to dominate women: the novel portrays its male characters as slaves of their sexual desires. Naomi believes that all men see love solely in terms of sex and need to be sexually-dominant in order to fulfil social and individual definitions of masculinity; she calls this need "the masculine principle, the fundamental Man-thought" (283). In an early amorous scene between Hugo and Naomi, he forcibly holds her close to him. The narrator comments on this incident with the following words: "Involuntary, was this act of *maleness*, this instinctive urge to assert his superior strength and reduce the woman-creature to a state of submission and obedience. The instant that he became conscious of his action and its significance, Main loosed his clasp" (emphasis in original 129). The mind-body dichotomy evident in Hugo at this moment is also evident in the characterization of the other major characters of the novel. Thus, the modernist sexual-liberation of the work exists in tension with accepted essentialist discourses. According to DeKoven, such waffling between tradition and innovation is part of the modernist project, a project in which we find "a simultaneity of desire to 'make it new' and fear of what the 'new' might be, an ambivalence freighted in opposite ways for male and female modernists (hence '*gendered* doubleness')" (21). Macbeth's awareness of this dilemma appears in the novel's preface, written in the form of a letter to a friend: "Woman is passing through a cultural transition. Instinctively, she is bound to the old order of things; intellectually, she clamours for the new. And vacillating, she stands between them" (*Shackles* n.p.).

Some readers were shocked by *Shackles*. An anonymous reviewer for *The Ottawa Journal* wrote:

> The question of sex being involved in the question of marriage, we are given a generous supply of such things, presented, some will think, with unnecessary frankness....To deal with sexual matters with truth and yet without vulgarity is a great art, an art which is not too evident in these pages. (NAC MG30 D52 Vol.16 File 1926 Loose Clippings)

Austin Bothwell called *Shackles* "the fantasy of a fanatic feminist" for its "portrayal of housework [and] managing a home" as detrimental to the creativity of a female writer (308). Bothwell missed the main point that Macbeth made, a point which was much more radical: marriage itself inhibits the creative woman and, under certain conditions, sex within marriage amounts to rape. On the other hand, in his review of *Shackles*, Raymond Knister called the novel "significant" because "It is one of the few grown-up books which have been written in Canada. The subject matter and the author's attitude toward it show that" (42). Furthermore, Deacon praised *Shackles* in *Saturday Night*'s Literary Section. He states:

> Mrs. Macbeth now stands with Coalfleet and Grove as one who is freeing the Canadian novel from the once all too just accusations of amateurishness. She makes

> here absolutely no concessions either to prudery or the cheap taste of an idle public. She writes it as she feels it, and preserves her artistic integrity. (NAC MG30 D52 Vol.16 File 1926 Loose Clippings)

Between 1924 and 1940, Macbeth moved closer to the modernist camp in her own writing as well as moving closer to modernist standards in her criticism of literature. *Shreds of Circumstance*, a novel about a family's geographic dislocation and the meaning of home, was finished in 1939; according to Macbeth's diary, it went through several rejections before its publication in 1947. However, Macbeth's writing does not draw on modernist literary strategies such as fragmentation of the narrative or stream of consciousness, until *Volcano*'s publication in 1963. These formal strategies, which are conventional today, were radical during the most productive years of Macbeth's career and, as a single mother, she had to adopt literary forms which would be readily understood and accepted by the purchasing audience of the large-scale field of literary production, the popular field of literature. On the other hand, feminist women writers of this period were among the few who turned to radical content in their novels; the focus of *Shackles* on the oppression of women within the home is a feminist strategy. Nellie McClung used fiction to attack the lack of legal protection available to married women. In *Purple Springs* (1921), Mrs. Paine's story, "The Storm," has the central position in the text. In "The Storm," the suffragist heroine, Pearl Watson, uses the physical deprivation of Mrs. Paine and her children as an example to argue for legal reform in property and custody laws. In *Wild Geese* (1925), Martha Ostenso writes of emotional blackmail and male patriarchal control within the Gare marriage. One daughter of the Gare family, Judith, discovers sexual desire and becomes pregnant outside marriage, defying her tyrannical father. Ostenso won a substantial prize for best first novel after the publication and critical acclaim of *Wild Geese*.

Articulations of Popular Literature, Literary Writing, Nationalism and Internationalism in the Canadian Literary Field, 1920-1950.

I have argued that modernism was as active in the Canadian literary field of 1920-1950 as it was in Anglo-American literary fields, and I have suggested definitions of low and high modernisms. Now I want to return to the Macbeth-Skinner dispute over the existence of a literary Canadian literature, a dispute which articulates with modernism through a mutual concern over the popular-literature/literary-writing binary. The field of Canadian literary production was highly polarized by debates over the standards by which a Canadian national literature should be judged. It was generally agreed that a truly national Canadian literary archive would develop from regional or local experience and knowledge; whether universal themes and international standards, the hallmarks of high culture, were appropriate to the development of a Canadian national literature was another question. The varying responses of continentalists, internationalists, and nationalists to the question of literary standards point to the underlying political nature of these cultural debates. As Bourdieu states:

> Specifically aesthetic conflicts about the legitimate vision of the world...about what deserves to be represented and the right way to represent it, are political conflicts (appearing in their most euphemized form) for the power to impose the dominant definitions of reality, and social reality in particular. (*Field of Cultural Production* 101-102)

In Canada, evidence that Canadian male critics of the middle and upper classes took advantage of their positions to include or exclude female writers from publication, as occurred in the cases of Livesay, Audrey Alexandra Brown, Doris Ferne, and Marjorie Pickthall among others, supports my contention that a gendered power struggle underlies debates in the Canadian literary field.[96] Furthermore, as discussed in Chapter 3, literary nationalists of both sexes considered the provincial governments' purchasing of American textbooks for use in Canadian schools to be counter productive to the development of national autonomy.

Literary nationalists contended that literary standards designed specifically for

Canada were in order, and they mobilized the infant nation concept for support of this contention. Proponents of the infant nation concept claimed that colonies of European imperial centres could not be expected to produce a sophisticated system of cultural production instantly, because they were preoccupied with the production of industrial, transportation, communication, and agricultural infrastructures. The infant nation argument was also drawn on by nineteenth-century Canadian business interests who appealed to economic nationalism for protective tariffs and government subsidies (Henley 110). As Fee writes, the Romantic nineteenth-century "concept of poetic evolution" led people "to assume that since Canada is young, her poetry will be too - naive, unpolished and crude" (83). This nineteenth-century argument persisted in certain Canadian literary circles for one hundred years. In 1984, Norris argues that Canada's infant-nation status accounts for the slow uptake of modernist concerns in Canada (8). Furthermore, he claims that Canada's colonial isolation from the imperial centre accounts for the time lag between the rejection of Victorian stylistics in England and in Canada. The corollary, which Norris fails to mention, is that Canada's distance from Britain, Canada's growing nationalism, and its multilingual cultures, were also likely to mitigate the strength of the hold that Victorianism had on its cultural life, that is, in comparison to the indigenous hold that Victorianism had on British society. In fact, Trehearne suggests that the long time lag between the development of aestheticism in Europe, which he dates at 1858-1870, and its appearance in Canada between 1890 and 1900, is partly due to Canadian poets' resistance to foreign influence (310-312).

Following the infant-nation discourse, Logan suggested in 1920 that Canadian literature be compared, for purposes of evaluation, to English language literatures of other British colonies, rather than to the canon of British or American literatures ("Teaching Canadian Literature in the Universities" 62). He reasoned that a national literature should be compared to another of similar age and development, and he suggested Australian literature as a fair comparison to Canadian literature. Two years earlier, in an article in *The Canadian Magazine*, Gibbon proposed the widespread subsidization of the producers and institutions within the Canadian literary field, subsidization that would be regulated

Canada were in order, and they mobilized the infant nation concept for support of this contention. Proponents of the infant nation concept claimed that colonies of European imperial centres could not be expected to produce a sophisticated system of cultural production instantly, because they were preoccupied with the production of industrial, transportation, communication, and agricultural infrastructures. The infant nation argument was also drawn on by nineteenth-century Canadian business interests who appealed to economic nationalism for protective tariffs and government subsidies (Henley 110). As Fee writes, the Romantic nineteenth-century "concept of poetic evolution" led people "to assume that since Canada is young, her poetry will be too - naive, unpolished and crude" (83). This nineteenth-century argument persisted in certain Canadian literary circles for one hundred years. In 1984, Norris argues that Canada's infant-nation status accounts for the slow uptake of modernist concerns in Canada (8). Furthermore, he claims that Canada's colonial isolation from the imperial centre accounts for the time lag between the rejection of Victorian stylistics in England and in Canada. The corollary, which Norris fails to mention, is that Canada's distance from Britain, Canada's growing nationalism, and its multilingual cultures, were also likely to mitigate the strength of the hold that Victorianism had on its cultural life, that is, in comparison to the indigenous hold that Victorianism had on British society. In fact, Trehearne suggests that the long time lag between the development of aestheticism in Europe, which he dates at 1858-1870, and its appearance in Canada between 1890 and 1900, is partly due to Canadian poets' resistance to foreign influence (310-312).

Following the infant-nation discourse, Logan suggested in 1920 that Canadian literature be compared, for purposes of evaluation, to English language literatures of other British colonies, rather than to the canon of British or American literatures ("Teaching Canadian Literature in the Universities" 62). He reasoned that a national literature should be compared to another of similar age and development, and he suggested Australian literature as a fair comparison to Canadian literature. Two years earlier, in an article in *The Canadian Magazine*, Gibbon proposed the widespread subsidization of the producers and institutions within the Canadian literary field, subsidization that would be regulated by the federal government:

> Should, for instance, the Government be asked to subsidize Canadian literature as, for instance, it subsidizes Canadian art, by purchasing and publishing manuscripts just as it purchases and provides a museum for works of art? Should a campaign be launched urging Canadian editors and publishers to give preference to fiction and poetry by Canadian authors, Canadian booksellers to push Canadian publications, Canadian readers to read and purchase by preference Canadian books, and Canadian reviewers to be particularly kind to Canadian novelists and poets? ("Where is Canadian Literature?" 333)

Most Canadian literary modernists were opposed to such measures, preferring that Canadian literature either sink or swim within the international English language literary field. As I shall argue, Canadian literary modernists failed to recognize the important role that capitalism plays in this field.

Florence Livesay, in the October 1925 - March 1926 issue of *Poetry* (Chicago), published a survey of Canadian literature titled "Canadian Poetry Today." Livesay, who was an active member of the CAA and a seasoned journalist, clearly and succinctly outlines the nationalist-internationalist opposition within the Canadian literary circles of her time:

> The latter [the CAA] has to stand up against some onslaughts of critics in the Dominion who are fearful that our literature takes itself too seriously. "Comparison!" one side cries; "measure yourself against 'the giants." "Growth," says the other "only please do watch us and know what you are talking about before you criticize; give us credit for what we are doing; read the books of other lands, but read native books also." (38)

Although she believes that Canadian literature should be measured by international standards, that is, against the best in the English-speaking world, Florence Livesay implies in this article that Canadian literature may someday be as internationally successful as the Group of Seven was at the Wembly art exhibition of 1925.

The existence of a Canadian literature that could satisfy universal aesthetic standards was most hotly contested during the 1920s and 1930s. Internationalists seemed unaware of the conflict between their call for universal themes and universal literary standards in Canadian literature, and their hopes for unique developments within a national literature, developments based on local and national Canadian cultures. Kennedy, Skinner, Smith, and Livesay stood for the application of international literary standards to Canadian literature. In their view, overt nationalism in literature was inappropriate to pure art. Macbeth, on the other hand, wanted Canadian writers to focus on Canadian locations, and she wanted critics to treat Canadian literature in a nurturing manner; she claimed that reviewers were too hard on Canadian writers. In a February 16, 1924 draft of her response to Skinner, Macbeth writes:

> In this connection I would say that to me we are like a child, who needs guidance rather than censure. The 'smart' opinions and heavy pronouncements that form the bulk of our 'criticism' are the best possible means for poisoning the very spirit you–and others–long to provoke. (NAC MG30 D52 Vol.2 Correspondence 1924 #978)

She called for a "a group of capable, constructive critics" of Canadian literature (#978). According to Vipond, Macbeth expressed this same maternal attitude toward Canadian literature a year earlier in a 1923 speech to an American Women's Club. The Montreal *Star* quotes Macbeth as saying to the American women, "We are like children going to school and needing a teacher. We need good criticism. You can't have a literature without sound literary criticism" (Vipond "The CAA in the 1920s" 76). Moreover, in her 1924 speech to the London branch of the Canadian Women's Club, Macbeth states:

> Canada has a literature. Make no mistake about that. The fact is not universally realized, and the growth is painfully slow because what we do lack is intelligent and sympathetic literary criticism. Between the group of friendly but unscholarly enthusiasts, and superior though unfriendly dogmatists, we stand bewildered, knowing not which way to turn. (CACRCO MG59 VOL 2 File 13 Pages 1,2).

Livesay's consistent stance for internationalist standards in Canadian literary criticism is clear in her 1939 article, "Open Letter to Sir Charles G.D. Roberts," which appeared in

The Canadian Bookman. In this article, Livesay attacks the idea of special critical treatment for Canadian writers:

> In my opinion there will be no young poets in Canada until we have mopped up every critic who has as yet ventured to speak in the respectable journals. For to call their namby-pamby back-patting, criticism, is to defile that word beyond recognition. Their argument is, presumably, that if anyone is found with even a glimmer of poetic expression, that glimmer must be nurtured long and carefully, with the utmost persuasive love. (34)

Livesay's proposition lies in direct opposition to Macbeth's letters and speeches on the need for supportive literary criticism in Canada. In one sense, Livesay's position is more nationalist than Macbeth's, whose invocation of the infant nation concept can be interpreted as patronizing. Macbeth's alignment with realist and modernist fiction, her prolonged participation in the CAA's promotion of a loyal audience for Canadian literature, and her later application of international literary standards to Canadian literature demonstrate not only the lack of homogeneity within the various camps of the Canadian literary field, but also the differing positions that could be and were taken by Canadian writers during this dynamic period.

In the first issue of the *Canadian Bookman* (1919), its editor, B.K. Sandwell, stated that the journal's reviewers would judge Canadian writing in relation to Canadian literature, not in comparison to British or American literature.[97] This stand is anti-modernist in that it does not support the idea of international literary standards; however, Sandwell also claimed that distinct literary standards should be devised for each national literature. He was not looking for special treatment for Canadian writers, as were Macbeth and the proponents of the infant-nation concept, but for sovereignty within the literary criticism of each English-speaking nation. According to Sandwell, *Canadian Bookman* reviewers would be encouraged to also judge Canadian literature by how well Canadian writers express Canadian ideas and Canadian lifestyles. Sandwell believed that Canadian writers should write for Canadian audiences about Canadian locales, ideas, and problems because Canadian writers are most familiar with these topics. His position is typical of proponents for a national literature that would represent and unify a nation. Sandwell used Haliburton's international success with *The Clockmaker* series as proof that achievement of a high level of writing within Canadian literature would automatically bring international recognition to Canadian writers. "Canadians writing like Americans or Englishmen will never produce a Canadian, or any, literature," he states ("Standards of Criticism" 8).

The internationalists of the twenties expected that these two processes would proceed in tandem: the quality of Canadian literature would improve while it was being measured by universal or international standards against the best in the literature of the English-speaking peoples. Implicitly, such improvement depended upon the leadership of Canadian literary critics, for which both nationalists and internationalists called. In 1944, Livesay singled out Smith as an example of the best kind of literary critic. In her review of Smith's anthology *The Book of Canadian Poetry*, she tells the reader:

> What you will find there is perhaps the best orientation towards Canadian poetry today. The critiques of W.E. Collin and E.K. Brown are valuable also, but to my way of thinking they lose perspective in dealing with their contemporaries. Overpraise is the most dangerous medicine this country can take. Smith is more objective. ("This Canadian Poetry" 20)

Collin and Brown were university professors of literature whose positions in the academy depended on the acceptance, on the part of their colleagues and university administrators, of Canadian literature as a subject worthy of study. In 1941, Brown edited a special issue of Canadian modernist poetry, including that of Livesay and the Montreal group, for *Poetry* (Chicago).[98] Here, Livesay emphasizes the objectivity which characterizes modernists' attitude to the `science' of poetry. Smith had himself been calling for useful intellectual criticism of Canadian literature since 1928. In "Wanted-Canadian Criticism," he describes the need for Canadian critics who will defend the writer's right to choose any subject matter, and for critics who will situate Canadian literature in the field of English language literatures. In effect, Smith calls for the creation of a national literature in Canada, but a national literature that is not nationalist. From the perspective of Romantic nationalism, which posits a national literature as a literature that represents and unifies a nation, a configuration such as Smith's is inherently contradictory. In the following passage, Smith is highly critical of the requirement of cultural nationalists like Macbeth and Sandwell that Canadian writing have specifically Canadian themes and settings:

> If you write, apparently, of the far north and the wild west and the picturesque east, seasoning well with allusions to the canada goose, fir trees, maple leaves, snowshoes, northern lights, etc., the public grasp [sic] the fact that you are a canadian poet, whose works are to be bought from the same patriotic motive that prompts the purchaser of Eddy's matches or a Massey-Harris farm implement, and read along with Ralph Connor and Eaton's catalogue. ("Wanted-Canadian Criticism" 600)

In Smith's view, nationalism in the Canadian literary field is synonymous with popular literature, tradition, and commerce, and opposed to both international standards and art for art's sake. However, his canonized poem, "The Lonely Land," expresses the love of land which is characteristic of Romantic nationalism. Smith's concluding words to the poem resonate with those of the national anthem of Canada, "the true north strong and free":

> This is the beauty
> of strength
> broken by strength
> and still strong.
>
> (*Canadian Poetry Volume One* 163).

Although Macbeth's writing reveals her disagreement with Smith on the status of Ralph Connor in the field of Canadian literary production, she admits that much of Canadian literature is "superficial" (CACRCO MG59 Vol.2 File 13 p.3a).[99] "We have recorded what we saw," she writes in 1924, "much as the artists have recorded landscape, and while this makes for literature, it does not produce works of the highest standard, in a day" (p.3.5). Furthermore, Macbeth disassociates herself from "Boosters' Club[s]" (NAC MG30 D52 Vol.2 Correspondence 1924 Item 978). Her overall complaint concerning

Skinner's review is that the review's title, "Wanted-A Literature," and the tone of the entire article perpetuate the "opinion held by most Americans (i.e. residents of the U.S.) and many Canadians" that there is no such thing as Canadian literature (Item 978). Macbeth writes, "I take the stand that constant denial of any thing will eventually tend to bring a condition of non-existence about. In other words, if enough people say that Canada has no literature, and say it long enough, Canada never will have any!" (Item 978). Macbeth's phrasing is ambiguous. Her words suggest that she views Canadian literature as if it were in its formative stages; at the same time, there is an assumption that Canadian literature exists as a fully-formed national literature which could be destroyed by negative criticism. Both viewpoints were proposed in debates over Canadian literature in the 1920s, indicating the instability of the literary field in this period. In response, Skinner claims that "most Americans hold no opinion whatever about Canadian literature" and accuses Macbeth and Deacon of misinterpreting her review (Item 988).

As literary editor of *Saturday Night* from 1922 to 1928, Deacon corresponded with Skinner about her review and he provided Macbeth with copies of his letters. In a letter to Macbeth dated February 27, 1924, Deacon criticizes Skinner for the fact that her review of literature of the Canadian northwest discusses three publications, only one of which is set in western Canada, *The Gaspards of Pine Croft* by Connor. Since Skinner was a continentalist who wrote on both the Canadian and American northwest, Deacon and Macbeth have a case. They also criticized Skinner for beginning with a discussion of writing on the Canadian northwest and ending with a comment on Canadian literature as a whole. Her final sentences are: "The imagination, the vision, the passion of the artist could ask no richer gift of native soil than the Canadian's heritage. But the interpreter, in whom intimacy has not stifled wonder, has not reappeared since David Thompson's day" (419). Skinner claims that this conclusion was a framing device that was structurally consistent with the beginning of her review, which was a discussion of David Thompson's original and valuable contribution to Canadian literature on the northwest. In fact, she was insulted by the suggestion that she had changed topics.

I would not dream of writing on Canadian Literature: I don't know it....I confess

> to a slight "peeve" that anyone should think me a writer of such poor technique as to start off with a long introduction which had no close connection with my theme....If I were capable of such scattered thinking and clumsy workmanship as you and Mr. Deacon accuse me of I would not be on Mr. Canby's list of reviewers. (NAC MG30 D52 Vol.2 Correspondence 1924 Item 988 emphasis in original)

Assumptions about the inferiority of Canadian literature, which were central to the debate over literary standards, continued to be addressed by Macbeth sixteen years after the dispute with Skinner. In a 1940 article, "Novelists...What Now?," Macbeth states, "I think we have a number of good writers, but not enough great writers" (4). Macbeth blames the Canadian reader for preferring non-Canadian literature; she blames the Canadian publisher for being "afraid to stake much on a Canadian manuscript"; and she blames the Canadian novelist for producing "cloudy and distorted images" of Canadian reality (4). According to Macbeth:

> Our work isn't good enough. Not the grammar. Not the syntax part of it, but the ethos. We don't - or won't - reflect life as we see it. In this country we are no better and no worse than people anywhere else. But we like to think we are better, and we like our reporter-novelists to tell us we are better...which is one reason our novels fail. (4)

Macbeth's insistence on the necessity for Canadian literature to be concerned with Canadian life and locales is an indicator of cultural nationalism, but it also indicates her preference for realistic literature. "With a few exceptions," she writes, "we have avoided the stuff that life is made of in our work....A great novel ought to be a mirror giving back a true picture of the image before it...we are not mirroring life as We live it" (4). Macbeth combines nationalism with realism by maintaining that realistic Canadian novels must reflect Canadian reality, not that of another nation. This is the same point made by Sandwell in his 1919 editorial, and by Skinner in her 1924 review. Skinner criticized Connor's *The Gaspards of Pine Croft* for its lack of place. "The spirit of the [B.C.] *locale* is not captured," she writes. "The scenery is described as well as in any guide book. That is the trouble. It remains `scenery'" (emphasis in original 419). Although nationalists and internationalists of the period envision the use of realism differently, Macbeth's emphasis on realism in literature is a factor common to both these groups. In her "Open Letter to Sir Charles G.D. Roberts," Livesay wrote, "I have been looking in vain, not for "proletarian poets" - we are far from that - but for some genuine expression of experience, related to the way people live and struggle in Canada" (35). In "Novelists...What Now?," Macbeth makes a similar point by claiming that Canadian literature's inadequacy in relation to the English-speaking literary canon is due to the small number of realistic and/or psychological novels being written in Canada. In making this claim, Macbeth applies universal standards, a principle of modernism, to Canadian literature; in addition, she uses canonical British and American writers as examples in her article. These articles by Livesay and Macbeth were published within a year of each other, at the start of WWII. While Livesay held to international literary standards throughout the time period under discussion, Macbeth moved, between 1924 and 1940, from supporting national literary standards to supporting international ones. If Skinner had published the same review fifteen years later, perhaps Macbeth would have been less irate and more open to agreement.

Literary Internationalists and the Political-Economic Hegemony.

George Grant's discussion of the roots of Canadian politics in *Lament for a Nation* sheds light on the position of the Canadian modernist writers who called for internationalist literary standards in Canadian literature, even though his text was written in reaction to the 1963 nuclear missile crisis in Canada. Grant situates the roots of twentieth-century conservative American politics in nineteenth-century British *laissez-faire* liberalism. In liberal political philosophy, Grant explains, individual freedom is valued over the needs of the community; on the other hand, in conservative political philosophy, restraints are placed on the individual for the benefit of the community (64). These restraints are common to socialism and conservatism, both of which value the common good above the individual's desires. As Grant and many others have pointed out, liberal philosophy defines the American constitution, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," and conservative philosophy is the basis of the British North America Act's concern with "peace, order, and good government." Grant also points out that internationalism serves the purposes of two diametrically opposed groups, communists and capitalists. The international social and political revolution that is the goal of communist parties is based on the idea of one world government; capitalism's dream is a global consumer society. Grant maintains that capitalists always have international priorities over national interests; in fact, he claims, capitalism and nationalism are inherently opposed. The nationalism of any ruling class depends upon the contemporary economic situation, and the Canadian ruling class, writes Grant, has changed from nationalist to anti-nationalist when such a transformation suits its goal to maximize profits. In 1998, when Jean Charest agreed to resign from the leadership of the federal Conservative Party and take on the leadership of the provincial Liberal Party in Quebec, the value of the Canadian dollar rose. Canadian and foreign investors' confidence in the continuation of a united federalist system in Canada motivated their investments, which, in turn, led to the dollar's rise in value. My example of the articulation of capitalism and politics in the contemporary Canadian field of power supports Grant's contention that investors' economic choices are often based on current national political events. Furthermore, says Grant, cultural and material homogenization inevitably result from multinational corporations' successful expansion of the consumer culture from North America to the world; such homogenizing effects do not respect specific countries, religions, or cultures.

An application of Grant's theory to the Canadian modernists of 1920-1950 suggests that they participated in the political and economic hegemony, in spite of the dissident self-image cultivated by some. Although they opposed Victorian forms of poetry and prose, Canadian modernists retained the tradition of universal, English language literary standards, which derive ultimately from the imperial centres of Britain and the U.S.A. Their unquestioning acceptance of the British literary canon and the dominance of European and American standards of literary excellence makes them part of the multinational homogenizing impulse, an impulse which affected Canada largely through the continental cultural dominance of the United States. Grant claims that, in Canada, internationalism is in practice continentalism, as I have noted it was for the Canadian communists; Grant interprets continentalism as supportive of the annexation of Canada to the United States. In the early twenties, American cultural influences became prominent in Canada through the new technology of radio and the boom in magazine publishing. Canadian nationalists feared the Americanization of Canadian culture through the media of radio and print but internationalists scoffed at such fears. As Grant writes, the "universal values" of liberalism "go with [continentalism and] internationalism rather than with nationalism" (86).

Grant's work provides an alternative perspective on the leftist modernists of the Canadian literary field, modernists such as Livesay and Scott, who adopted universal literary standards but rejected continentalism. If we apply Grant's thesis to the literary field of this time period, Canadian internationalists, who opposed the adoption of a literary standard specific to and tailored for Canada, were contributing to the development of cultural continentalism, in spite of their adherence to European and British literary standards. In fact, many Canadian modernist writers moved to the United States for work; Kennedy, Smith, and Skinner are only a few of the Canadian literary expatriates of 1920-1950. According to Graham Carr, "Although a pattern of intellectual migration back and forth across the border had been visible in Canadian history since the late nineteenth century, it reached an unprecedented scale in the 1920s and 1930s" (151). Carr calculates that of sixteen Canadian literary critics who were born between 1896 and 1909, eleven resided in the United States for a minimum of one year and ten worked there "for a period of at least a year at some point during the 1920s and 1930s" (152). Livesay was part of this group.

We are faced with a paradox. Scott and Livesay, who were dissidents in their writing and politics, were also part of a cultural and intellectual elite, a cadre of middle-class Canadians who were educated abroad. Although they position themselves on the left in the Canadian literary field of their contemporaries, their insistence on universal literary standards, which derive from the international language of English, is also useful to the capitalist and continentalist hegemony of both Canada and the United States. This usefulness complicates their professed desire for a distinctive, national Canadian literature.

It also illustrates the complexity of the Canadian literary field during this time period and the relations between the fields of culture (literature, art, music, dance, film) and power (politics, economics, science, technology, education, religion). Moreover, the usefulness of leftist cultural producers to the political and economic hegemony demonstrates the domination of the field of culture by the field of power.

Another example of complicity with the forces of continentalist homogenization is provided by Lorne Pierce's and Harold Innis's experiences during the production of "The Relations of Canada and the United States," which was published between 1937 and 1945. This twenty-five volume series was a scholarly collection on "aspects of the economic, political and social history of Canada and the United States" (Campbell 106). The series was funded by the Carnegie Corporation; the Canadian volumes were edited by Innis and Pierce and published by Ryerson. However, the project editor was employed by the Carnegie Endowment, and Pierce was unable to get approval of his "proposal for a series volume on Canadian and American literature from leading Canadian critic E.K. Brown" (Campbell 110). According to Sandra Campbell, "Innis later labelled the omission of such a volume 'ominous,' given the importance of cultural relations to a true understanding between nations" (110). The omission of a cultural volume was an ominous sign for another reason: the editor who refused funding was James Shotwell, a Canadian historian who was "Director of the Division of Economics and History at the wealthy Carnegie Endowment for International Peace" (Campbell 106). Shotwell's decision to exclude culture from "one of the major historical publications of the era" was allegedly based on "lack of funds" (106, 110). However, the ability of the Carnegie Endowment Fund to disseminate a continentalist philosophy through this series and through its educational projects, and its ability, in general, to participate in cultural imperialism depended on its economic power, power gained from Andrew Carnegie's industrial profits. If culture had been as highly valued by Shotwell as were the disciplines of economics and history, it is likely that funding would have been found. Furthermore, if Shotwell valued cultural nationalism above cultural continentalism, it is possible that the proposed Brown volume would have been approved. Shotwell's decision to omit culture from the series suggests not only the domination of the field of culture by the field of power, but also the accuracy of Bourdieu's claim that cultural producers make up the dominated fraction of the dominant class.

In conclusion, I want to return to Norris's and Trehearne's claim that modernism appeared in the Canadian literary field much later that it did in either the British or American literary fields. Following Dudek and Gnarowski, Norris's thesis is that "It was only with the rise of the little magazine that a local setting for Modernism would be provided" in Canada (11). This setting, he states, occurred in the 1940s, long after modernism had made a mark on Anglo-American and European literatures (9). Locally-produced little magazines may have been instrumental in the dissemination of modernist poetry in Europe and the United States, as Norris argues, but modernism appeared in Canadian literature before a little magazine industry was able to develop. Besides inappropriately applying a universal model to Canadian modernism, Norris refuses to consider Stringer's or Call's early modernist poetry and manifestos as emblematic of a modernist movement in Canada because they both returned to more traditional writing at a later date. He also dismisses Ross's, Knister's, and Livesay's early poetry from the modernist category because "Their activity was individual and unrelated; their poems appeared in American and English literary publications" (11). This statement is inaccurate. Livesay's early poetry appeared in *Chatelaine* in 1928, in the *Privateer* in 1929, and in the Canadian Authors Association's *Poetry Yearbook* in 1928 and 1930. Furthermore, Norris follows Dudek and Gnarowski in their decision to ignore Florence Livesay, Bowman, and other Canadian modernist poets who published both in Canadian cultural journals and in the early issues of one of the primary organs of English-language modernism, the American journal *Poetry* (Chicago). Thus, Norris perpetuates the masculinism of the literary field by selecting out Canadian women modernists. Finally, Pound, Stein, Beckett, and Lowell were all expatriate modernist writers who lived outside their birth countries, and who published both in the U.S.A. and in foreign publications; yet I am aware of no literary critic who attempts to denigrate their prominence in the history of modernism. In fact, geographical dislocation was part of the modernist experience. Norris's, Dudek's, and Gnarowski's insistence that evidence of a coherent and organized group of self-conscious modernists is essential to the definition of a modernist literary movement amounts to a double standard.

Trehearne's position on the thirty-year lag between Anglo-American modernism and Canadian modernism is more nuanced. Although he states that his work "lend[s] support to a qualified and relative version" of the time lag theory, he sees little lag between the rise of modernism in Canada and its appearance in Europe. However, Trehearne does claim that aestheticism, which he believes had an important and lasting influence on Canadian modernism, took thirty years to arrive in Canada in 1890. He suggests that the Scott-Smith literary generation was powerless to shake off aestheticism's influence. He writes, "Whenever the Canadians chose to name the enemy, it was Victorianism; they appear to have recognized in Aestheticism a rather shamefaced older cousin with whom they were necessarily allied in that battle" (269). In addition, Trehearne posits the Scott-Smith generation of Canadian poets, excluding Livesay, as the first modernist poets in Canada, a contention with which I take issue (115). Moreover, Trehearne, correctly I believe, places less value on the position of the *McGill Fortnightly Review* (1925-1927) as signifier of early Canadian modernism than do Norris, Dudek, and Gnarowski. "It was a proving ground," he writes, "and possibly it reveals the halcyon days of a generation: but it was not, by any means, a Modernist journal" (252). Norris, following Dudek and Gnarowski before him, cites this little magazine as instrumental in the development of Canadian literary modernism. The *McGill Fortnightly Review* has an important position in the development of modernism in Canada, but it was not of monumental importance; Norris is being selective in favour of male modernist Canadian writers.

Trehearne's thesis, that Canadian modernist poets are heavily indebted to aestheticism, is well substantiated by textual evidence, but it lacks cultural and political context. Trehearne belongs to the school of New Criticism; he conducts a detailed analysis of the recurring themes of death, beauty, and time in Kennedy's poetry, for instance, as evidence of the influence of the decadent movement on his writing, but he ignores Kennedy's political radicalization, a dramatic transformation that affected Kennedy's writing during the thirties. According to Huyssen, the canon of Anglo-American criticism is guilty of denigrating "politically-committed art and literature," and Trehearne appears to be part of this trend (31). Furthermore, Trehearne overestimates Kennedy's place in Canadian literary history. If Kennedy, who contributed nothing to Canadian literature after he moved to the United States in the late 1930s to pursue a career as advertising copywriter, can be hailed as leaving a "substantial, even seminal" legacy, then Livesay, who wrote and published in the Canadian literary field for over sixty years, must be acknowledged as a far more substantial contributor to Canadian literature (115). By excluding Livesay from his study, Trehearne participates in the marginalization of female Canadian writers. The following claim made by DeKoven on behalf of American women novelists applies equally well to the Canadian literary field: "female writers fashioned modernist narrative forms at the same time as the customarily accredited male proto-modernists and modernist originators" (20). Trehearne's marginalization of Livesay's work is consistent with his use of masculinist and homophobic rhetoric throughout *Aestheticism and the Canadian Modernists*.[100]

The works of Livesay and Macbeth articulate with the tensions among modernism, nationalism, and internationalism. While Livesay valued high art above popular literature, she modified high modernism to accommodate her chosen audience, the working class, a class to which she did not belong but with whose struggle she sympathized. At the same time, Livesay's temporary political position-taking among the members of the working class and political far left turned her away from cultural nationalism and toward continentalism and internationalism. The low modernist genre empowered Livesay to negotiate the articulations of modernism, class, and politics. Similarly, Macbeth developed her writing to negotiate the articulation of popular literature and high modernism in relation to her audience of middle-class English Canadians. Both Livesay's and Macbeth's literary trajectories were influenced by material considerations and both writers made decisions based on professional concerns. Just as Woolf sought a fair market salary as a signifier of her professional status, so did Livesay and Macbeth. Their choices of well-paying outlets for their writing, such as *The Star Weekly*, testifies to this fact. However, Macbeth's class position and late support of international literary standards suggest that she may have positioned herself more centrally in the modernist arena, for instance at the pure art end of the popular-literature/pure-art continuum, had her husband lived and supported her financially. As a single woman who was estranged from her family during an economic recession, Livesay also had to earn a living; nevertheless, she chose, in 1936, to invest a small inheritance from her aunt Ina Livesay in a cross Canada tour, during which she gave public speeches in support of the trade union movement and readings from her poetry. Macbeth's membership in an artistic and chronological generation which struggled with Livesay's generation over the transformation of Victorian writing to modernist writing suggests that her novels may still have expressed conservative or traditional concerns, regardless of the form of her writing or her source of financial support. Moreover, the work of both of these women writers was marginalized within the Canadian literary field by virtue of their works' content and their audiences. In the next chapter, I focus on Livesay's position in the Canadian literary field of the 1930s, and I examine the exclusionary tactics employed by male modernist Canadian poets and by anthologists of both Victorian and modernist literary persuasions.

Chapter 5

Anthologies and the Canonization Process: the Case of Dorothy Livesay and *New Provinces* (1936)

> *What is commonly called literary history is actually a record of choices.* (Berkinow in Gerson, "Anthologies and the Canon of Early Canadian Women Writers" 65)

Just as there are many modernisms, there are many canons, including the literary canon, the feminist canon, and the curricular or institutional canon. Drawing on American critic Alistair Fowler's categories of canons, Alan C. Golding discusses three canons: the potential canon constitutes the entire archive of literary production, the accessible canon includes those works which remain in print, and the selective canon is made up of accessible literature that is deemed to be of the highest quality (Golding 279). However, as Golding points out, "selection precedes as well as follows the formation of the accessible canon, affecting the form that 'accessibility' takes" (279). For instance, publishers, whose decisions are determined by market factors, have a major role in the construction of the accessible canon. Furthermore, decisions concerning what is the highest quality in literature depend on the evaluator's gender, class, race, age, and position in the literary field. As Gerson points out, selective decisions on Canadian literature began to be made in the forties and fifties, when "[t]he old preservative notion of defining a literature as the sum of its practitioners yielded to the evaluative principle of choosing only the 'best'" ("Anthologies and the Canon of Early Canadian Women Writers" 60).

Canonization is a complex process of construction, a process which articulates with race, class, the popular literature-pure art continuum, institutional power struggles, gender and the concept of artistic generations. As Robert Lecker points out, the traditional canon of Canadian literature has been racialized white and gendered male, and "the canonizers can demonstrate their liberalism by admitting a few token savages" ("The Canonization of Canadian Literature" 669). Paul Lauter sees similar exclusionary and segregating practices in the United States (438-439, 445, 451). John Guillory views the canon as a middle-class enterprise because being represented in the canon, and thereby acquiring cultural capital, means little to those who seldom read (38). Frank Davey correctly points to state institutions as important players in the canon-making process ("Canadian Canons" 678). For example, the Canada Council funds high art and refuses to fund organizations, such as the CAA, which are perceived to be driven by commercial concerns. Through its control over the administration of federal funds, the Canada Council has the power to perpetuate the view of the CAA as a forum of writers who are attached primarily to the marketplace, that is, at the popular literature end of the popular-literature/pure-art continuum. Furthermore, educational institutions, in their roles as marketplaces for textbook publishers, have the power to create canons through the development of syllabi. Canadian cultural nationalists of the 1920s, such as the members of the CAA and publishers Lorne Pierce and Hugh Eayrs, were instrumental in the production of historical and literary textbooks based on English-Canadian perspectives. The history of the curricula in which these textbooks appear reveals the processes through which noncanonical works become canonical (Guillory 51).

Gender articulates with several of the factors related to the canon-making process. As Guillory points out, "The distinction between serious and popular writing is a condition of canonicity," one that keeps most women outside the canon, because their work is labelled popular or non-serious (23). This feminization process had important repercussions on the evaluation by literary critics of imagism's place within modernism. The corollary to the exclusion of femininized forms of writing is the inclusion of masculinized forms of writing, an activity I discuss in this chapter. On the other hand, publishers' choices are often made on the basis of gendered perceptions in conjunction with literary values. During the Victorian-modernist literary battles of the 1920s, Pierce published Marjorie Pickthall's and Audrey Alexandra Brown's Victorian verse in a deliberate attempt to displace, at one and the same time, modernist forms of writing and New-Woman forms of behaviour (Campbell 146-149).

Finally, the concept of artistic generations articulates with the canon-making process on several levels. First, writers insert themselves into the established canon by reacting to the work of their precursors. For instance, Livesay's essay, "The Documentary

Poem: A Canadian Genre," functions to situate her "own poem of the frontier versus industrialism, *The Outrider*," in relation to the poetry of her precursors Pratt and Crawford, and her contemporaries Birney and Marriott (281). Second, changes in the canon signify changes in artistic generations, including the artistic generations of literary critics. New Critic Cleanth Brooks sees canon reformation as part of the generational struggle in the subfield of literary criticism (355). As Donald Morton puts it, canonical changes do not involve "getting rid of thrones, but dethroning one academic claimant for the sake of enthroning another" (in Moore 432). Both literary critics and writers participate in the dethroning and enthroning struggle.

An example of this dethroning process is found in the debates that took place between John Sutherland and A.J.M. Smith in 1947. Their debates represent the struggle between the second and third artistic generations of Canadian modernist poets. In the introduction to *Other Canadians, An Anthology of the New Poetry in Canada 1940-1946* (1947), Sutherland attacks Smith's critical work, especially his distinction between native and cosmopolitan poets, a distinction which Smith applied to Canadian modernist poets in the first edition of *The Book of Canadian Poetry* (1943). Livesay's work was listed by Smith as part of "The Native Tradition," with Pratt, Ross, Knister, Birney, Marriott, Colman, and others (xiv-xv). According to Sutherland's understanding of Smith's categories, native poets are Canadian nationalists, remnants of the nineteenth-century maple tree school of nature poets who were so often derided by modernists of all stripes, including Livesay. However, Sutherland sees a similarity between the loyalty to Britain declared by many English-Canadian nationalists, and the Eurocentrism of Smith's cosmopolitan modernism. In fact, Sutherland was a continentalist, socialist, and modernist in 1947; he depicted Smith as a stuffy, Eurocentric elitist who was constructed by his classical education. Moreover, at this period of his life, Sutherland was a Marxist, opposed to all religion. In his introduction, Sutherland uses Bishop Smith as an epithet for two reasons: first, Smith writes metaphysical verse and he values what literary historian Millar MacLure calls "a taste at once catholic and refined"; second, Smith pontificates about a tradition in Canadian poetry, a tradition that is denied by Sutherland (538). In his introduction, Sutherland writes:

> Bishop Smith, operating in the Canadian diocese, is faced with what are still frontier conditions. There are so many diverse, recalcitrant elements that no matter how one tars and feathers them they cannot all be made to look the same...We could only use the word tradition if we believed that the poetry was so blended with the life of the country that it was able to reach into the present and influence its course. (Dudek & Gnarowski 52, 50)

However, Smith's tradition of Canadian poetry was influencing Sutherland's critical writing by providing a force against which to struggle, and a position from which to distinguish himself. Through his attack on Smith, Sutherland carves out a position for himself within the field of Canadian poetry, and a potential entry into the literary canon. According to Philip Kokotailo, Sutherland's criticism was instrumental in effecting Smith's removal of the native and cosmopolitan categories in the second and third editions of *The Book of Canadian Poetry* (1948, 1957), in which Livesay and her "Native" colleagues are listed under "Modern Poetry" (xix). Furthermore, Smith's and Sutherland's positions were not as divergent as Sutherland claimed they were. Kokotailo writes:

> By the end of 1950 he [Sutherland] had fully reversed himself, making it clear that he no longer subscribed to the anti-religious, pro-socialist position from which he first attacked Smith....His youthful rebellion against the bishop and his book evolved into submission when Smith incorporated Sutherland's heresy into a new testament. The social mission of the literary church they fashioned together, finally, was to validate the present, *their* present, by harmonizing it with the past. (73-74, 66)

Kokotailo's continuation of Sutherland's ecclesiastical metaphor highlights the canon-making role played by the Smith-Sutherland skirmish over Canadian poetic tradition or the lack of it. Furthermore, through his attack on the poets who preceded him, Sutherland attempts to establish a new tradition, the tradition of his contemporaries, "the new social poetry of the forties" (55). In his bid for canonization in the Canadian literary field, Sutherland claims that "the new movement" was born from the work of British social poets, such as W.H. Auden and Stephen Spender, with only secondary influences from Canadian social poets of the thirties, such as Livesay, Kennedy, and Benson (55).

Livesay had her own confrontation with another member of Sutherland's artistic generation, Patrick Anderson, editor of Montreal's *Preview* magazine. The dispute arose after Livesay's review of Smith's first edition of *The Book of Canadian Poetry* was published in *The Canadian Forum* of April 1944. In her laudatory review of Smith's work, Livesay accuses the Anderson generation of "bewilderment, imitation" (20). "There is a yearning to break free," she writes, "but it is rarely accomplished" ("This Canadian Poetry" 20). According to Livesay, the work of Page, Shaw and Anderson is self-centred, focused on "the country of their own heads," and pays too much attention to formal aspects such as "florid texture," and rhyme (20). Livesay wants "ideas" in the new modernist poetry of Canada and she suggests that Anderson has the potential to achieve the "combination of vivid, arresting imagery and the capacity to 'sing' with social content and criticism" (20). Livesay's decision to criticize some of the next generation of modernist poets in a review of an anthology by a member of her own generation amounts to a defensive strategy. The Sutherland-Anderson generation viewed Livesay and Smith as the establishment whose standards they had to oppose, yet Livesay judged the newcomers as inadequate. In response to her review, Anderson, an immigrant from Britain, wrote to *The Canadian Forum*, and accused Livesay of labouring under "A colonial fear of cosmopolitanism, a provincial carping at those derivations and early dependencies which are inevitable in young writers. Whom does she want us to admire and to have emulated in our youth - E.J. Pratt?" (44). In view of Livesay's praise of Pratt's long documentary poems in "The Documentary Poem: A Canadian Genre," it is likely that she would have recommended Pratt to Anderson and his colleagues at *Preview*. Furthermore, Pratt was a longstanding friend of the senior Livesays. After the publication of Sutherland's letter, and referring to Livesay's poem "West Coast," which had been published in *Contemporary Verse* of January 1944, Pratt wrote to Livesay: "It [West Coast] makes that mis-called social verse of Anderson and his *Preview* adolescents look like gelatine. You are putting them all in the shade with your fine muscular poetry" (UA, 96-69, Queen's Box 2, File 24, June 26, 1944).[101] Livesay had the last word in the July issue of *The Canadian Forum*; in her letter to the editor, she described Anderson's use of "colonial" as a case of "the imperialistic sneer" (89). Her response to this accusation constitutes a defence of her social activism during the period 1930-1936. She writes:

> If I betray "a 'colonial' fear of cosmopolitanism," how is it that while those of Mr. Anderson's generation were attending English public schools, I was observing at first hand the rise of fascism in France and Germany; and while they were being psychoanalysed, I was doing everything possible, through organization and through written poetry, to aid in the liberation of Spain? (89)

Political and class differences form the subtext of this exchange between Livesay and Anderson. Livesay's claim to belong to a lower class than Anderson is inaccurate. Although it is true that public schools in England are open only to the upper middle and upper class, Livesay benefited from her upper-middle-class family's ability to finance her studies at a private girls' high school, at the University of Toronto, and at the Sorbonne. On the other hand, Livesay's personal commitment to the working class and the victims of institutionalized injustice is undeniable. In this self-portrayal, Livesay emphasizes her position-taking in solidarity with those of a class different from that of her birth family. Whether Page, Shaw, or Anderson ever were psychoanalyzed is irrelevant; Livesay's aim was to belittle the content of their poetry in favour of subject matter that reveals the poet's commitment to social change. The underlying assumptions of these writers' words point to a major difference in their attitudes concerning how a writer should deal with the dichotomy between the individual subject-position and the community. *Ad hominem* arguments are the means both choose to make their points.

The Smith-Sutherland and Livesay-Anderson debates arose in response to the publication of a major anthology, *The Book of Canadian Poetry*. Compiling and publishing anthologies is a strategy used by each artistic generation to enter a canon; moreover, once they are established within a canon, writers perpetuate their positions by "repeatedly acknowledg[ing] one another," as Smith did his later editions of *The Book of Canadian Poetry* (Kenner 374). Writers of a new artistic generation often anthologize themselves with their contemporaries and allies. Golding points out that in 1793 Elihu Hubbard Smith, an early American anthology editor, "compiled a book dominated by his friends, by Connecticut poets, by Federalists," to advance his own nationalist goals (281). In "The Confessions of a Compulsive Anthologist," Smith admits that the production of *New Provinces* (1936) was motivated by a similarly masculine collegiality, although not by nationalism. "It was to have been simply a selection of poems by four friends who had been contributors to the *McGill Fortnightly Review* (1924-25) and the *Canadian Mercury* (1928-29) - Frank Scott, Leo Kennedy, A.M. Klein, and myself," Smith writes (5). Livesay produced two anthologies in the 1970s: in 1972, she edited *Forty Women Poets of Canada*, and in 1974, she edited *Woman's Eye: 12 B.C. Poets.* Livesay makes her motivation for the production of these volumes clear in a speech: "It had bothered me considerably that so many of our anthologies were edited by men and gave only token time and space to women poets" (UM Mss 37 Box 106 Fd 20 "Talk on Canadian Literature" 5). Livesay is not alone in her concerns. Several feminist Canadian literary critics have addressed the paucity of women in the English-Canadian canon by producing both literary criticism of the canon and anthologies which address their criticisms.[102] The two anthologies edited by Livesay include her contemporary, Anne Marriott, as well as Canadian women poets of following artistic generations, such as P.K. Page, Margaret Atwood, Margaret Avison, Joy Kogawa, Gwendolyn MacEwen, and Phyllis Webb.

Long before she was motivated to become an anthology editor, Livesay personally experienced the exclusionary practices of male anthologists. The exclusionary tactics adopted by Livesay in her two anthologies of 1972 and 1974 do not carry the same weight in the literary field as do the exclusionary tactics of Scott and Smith in their production of *New Provinces.* Female anthologists are few and marginal within the subfield of anthology publication, and the symbolic violence performed by the exclusion of male writers is much less than that performed by the exclusion of female writers, who have fewer options for publication. Livesay's exclusions were performed in reaction to a systemic exclusion of female writers from the areas of most power within the literary field. New women writers are handicapped both by gender and by artistic generation, while new male writers struggle mainly with their newness.

Questions surrounding the canonization process are central not only to the exclusionary tactics practised by anthologists of the 1920-1950 period, but also to the interpretations of this particular historical moment by later literary critics. As Gerson argues in "Anthologies and the Canon of Early Canadian Women Writers," between the two world wars, Canadian women were prolific writers and their works appear in contemporary anthologies, although less often than do the works of male writers, as I will demonstrate. Gerson's thesis is that anthologists of later generations have rewritten literary history by removing those earlier anthologized Canadian women writers from later anthologies. The switch from a preservative to an evaluative anthologization process highlights systemic patterns of discrimination and delegitimization which underlie evaluations, and the role played by the personal and literary values of each anthologist; whether acknowledged or not, these values include a viewpoint on gender. In the mid-1930s, Livesay's poetry was excluded from *New Provinces, Poems of Several Authors* (1936), which was edited by Scott and Smith, for reasons of professionalism, gender, and political position-taking. Nevertheless, as I argue in this chapter, Smith's commitment to producing a representative volume of Canadian modernist poetry overrode his misogyny, but Scott felt no such commitment.

New Provinces (1934-1936): Class and Professionalization

> *But now when I look back on the way that the history of Canadian literature has been written, it's been documented mainly by Frank Scott and A.J.M. Smith themselves and they have created their own little history.* (Webb in Wachtel 14)

In 1976, Michael Gnarowski edited a reissue of *New Provinces: Poems of Several Authors* (1936), which the publisher, the University of Toronto Press, hailed as "a monument in Canadian literature" (front flyleaf). In his introduction, Gnarowski describes *New Provinces as* "a singular event in a literary process which stemmed from the origins of Canadian modernism and its beginnings in Montreal" (vii). Like Gnarowski, literary critics Desmond Pacey and Munro Beattie have contributed to the retrospective canonization of *New Provinces.*[103] In *The Literary History of Canada*, Beattie calls *New*

Provinces "a literary milestone," and "a literary signpost" (753, 754). However, contemporary critics were not laudatory. Writing in *The Canadian Forum*, Edgar McInnis, a University of Toronto assistant professor of history, claims that *New Provinces* and three other volumes of poetry all lack direction; he singles out the work of Pratt and Kennedy as the best in the anthology, a statement which must have galled Smith. In *The Dalhousie Review*, B.M. recognized generational differences in literary audiences by distinguishing between "those who think only in terms of the 19th century" and "those in the stream of modern poetry" (534). Although B.M. claims that both *The White Savannahs*, a critical text by W.E. Collin, and *New Provinces* "mark a new stage in Canadian literature," s/he halfheartedly recommends *New Provinces* to the reader (534). Only E.K. Brown gives high praise for the volume; however, his praise seems tempered by his comparison of the poetry of *New Provinces* to British and American poetry of more than a decade earlier, a comparison which suggests that the Canadian modernists were behind the cultural leaders at the centres of the English-speaking world. "The poems in the anthology," Brown writes in the *University of Toronto Quarterly*'s "Letters in Canada: 1936," "are closer in spirit and technique to the best English and American poetry of the twenties than anything that has yet appeared in Canada, except Mr. Kennedy's *The Shrouding* and Miss Dorothy Livesay's *Signpost*" (341). As Brown notes, Livesay had already published *Signpost* (1932) and an earlier volume of modernist poetry, *Green Pitcher* (1928).

If Livesay was part of the modernist artistic generation in Canada in 1936, why was her work excluded from the only anthology of modernist verse that was able to achieve publication during the Depression? At least three reasons for the inclusion of Livesay's work in *New Provinces* come readily to mind. First, Livesay belongs to this group of poets; the literary critics of 1936 and since have included her among the earliest modernist writers of Canada. In his review, Brown himself twice mentions Livesay in relation to the poets of *New Provinces* (341, 347). In 1967, Milton Wilson edited *Poets Between the Wars*, a volume for McClelland and Stewart's canonizing New Canadian Library series. In his anthology, Wilson reproduces the work of Pratt, Scott, Smith, Livesay and Klein, in that order. Second, Livesay's short story, "Heat," had already been published in the second issue of *The Canadian Mercury* (January 1929), organ of the young modernists of Montreal, yet she was not included by Smith in the group of four friends which he later identified as the core of *New Provinces*. The publication of Livesay's prose writing in a short-lived journal which has since been hailed by Gnarowski, Dudek, and Norris as central to the development of modernism in Canada is an implicit admission of Livesay's position in the field of Canadian modernist literature. In fact, one of the earliest modernist writers in Canadian literary history, Raymond Knister, recognized the value and potential of Livesay's writing and suggested that she submit her work to the editors of *The Canadian Mercury*. The Livesay-Knister correspondence shows that, as a university student in Toronto in 1928, Livesay was aware of the early work of the Montreal group.[104] Second, in a 1944 review of Livesay's *Day and Night*, a review written for the next-generation modernist magazine, *First Statement*, Scott describes Livesay as "a contemporary of the growing number of Canadian poets on whom the impact of the present age is direct and not derivative" (23). Derivative was an epithet hurled at the Victorians by the Canadian modernists, who believed that the newness of their modernist cultural productions protected them from similar criticism. Third, in the early stages of the production of *New Provinces*, Smith twice explicitly suggested to Scott that Livesay's poetry be included in the volume.[105] Scott twice refused, suggesting in turn that Livesay's work be included in a second, "more political" edition of *New Provinces* at a later date.[106]

Scott's distinction between a later political and a current apolitical edition of *New Provinces* reveals one possible reason for Livesay's exclusion; his words reflect the unspoken distinction between low and high modernism. Livesay's low modernist poetry, concerned as it was with the struggle between trade unions and capitalists, was written in a style that contrasted starkly with the apolitical aesthetic modernism of the poets in *New Provinces*. Smith was more willing than Scott to publish both low and high modernist poetry in the anthology. In a February 15, 1934, letter to Scott, Smith gestures to the assumptions of the period, assumptions that array communism, internationalism, and modernism against the CAA, cultural nationalism, and Victorian writing by suggesting that the preface to the volume should "Attack nationalism in art and politics. Attack the

CAA and the typical national poets - Robert Service, Wilson Macdonald - and suggest that communism may provide these poets with an ideal that nationalism has failed to give" (February 15 1934). That ideal is international literary standards, over which, as I have pointed out, the Canadian literary field of this period was divided. Differences among the politics of Scott, Smith, and Livesay are elided by Smith in his eagerness to bolster a nonexistent unity among the members of the modernist camp, who faced a largely Victorian and nationalist literary field. In the same letter to Scott, Smith writes:

> I wish we could get some verse that is definitely politically left wing and at the same time good poetry. Has Dorothy Livesay anything of this sort?
>
> I am beginning to think we ought to invite her to submit some stuff. After all, it can't be any worse than some of the things we've got. (February 15, 1934)

In spite of the half-hearted, tentative nature of Smith's suggestion, his letter shows that he was open to exploring avenues that, if followed, could have resulted in a much different anthology, one that would have recognized the importance of both low and high modernist poetry. In DiBatttista's terms, such a publication would constitute a "zone of convergence" within modernism, that is an arena in which the extremities of the low/high binary do not dominate (18).

Smith's phrase, "some of the things we've got," refers to the work of Kennedy, Pratt and Finch, all of which Smith criticized in his letters to Scott. Finch's "images [were] trite and undistinguished," and some of his lines were "distressingly Emily Dickensian [sic]" (undated 1934). Smith declared that he didn't "trust" Kennedy's "judgement or his taste" (July 14, 1939), and he believed Pratt to be "the weakest member of the group - judging of course by his inclusions only" (March 7, 1934). When Pratt and Finch vetoed the strongly worded preface Smith had written for the volume, Smith described Pratt's poetry as "insipid stuff" (February 6, 1936). "Who the hell are Finch and Pratt to object to the preface?" he asked Scott. "If I am willing to let my poems come out in the same book with Pratt's insipid stuff, he can take the preface" (February 6, 1936). Pratt's position in 1935 as editor of the CAA's new magazine, *The Canadian Poetry Magazine*, was also considered during the debate over Smith's rejected preface. Pratt objected to the preface because it could alienate half his magazine's readers, and Scott wrote to Finch, "We would not willingly compromise him" (December 22, 1935).

Pratt was included in *New Provinces* for his cultural capital and relational power. Macmillan Canada had published Pratt's poetry in the past, and Pratt approached Hugh Eayrs on behalf of the group (November 7, 1934). Pratt's connection to an important publisher of contemporary Canadian literature, his editorial role at *The Canadian Poetry Magazine*, and his established academic record were valuable assets. When Kennedy balked at Eayrs' condition, that the poets pay two hundred dollars toward the production of seven hundred copies of *New Provinces*, Scott looked elsewhere, and submitted the manuscript to the Dent publishing company. Pratt threatened to leave the project if Macmillan did not publish it, citing "financial obligation[s]" to Macmillan (Nov 30 1934). In the end, Scott paid the bulk of the cost, $120, while Finch and Pratt each contributed $40. Smith, who could easily afford the fee, refused to contribute because of the fracas over his rejected preface. Kennedy and Klein were both unable to contribute due to their low incomes and familial obligations. This financial arrangement points to the class differences within the *New Provinces* group. Pratt, Scott, Finch, and Smith were all academics.[107] Livesay was a student; moreover, she studied a feminized discipline, social work, which was in transition from nonprofessional to professional status. In Canada, the late twenties and thirties saw the development of social work from a philanthropic vocation requiring no training, to a semi-profession requiring a university degree. The sharp increase in both unemployment and homelessness during the Great Depression acted as a catalyst on the professionalization of social work (Struthers 63-65). Both Harry Cassidy, a member of the LSR and a colleague of Scott's, and Charlotte Whitton, "the most influential Canadian social worker of her era," were instrumental in this professionalization process (Struthers 75).[108] From September 1933 to May 1934, that is, while *New Provinces* was being edited, Livesay was an apprentice social worker at the Family Service Bureau in Montreal, as partial fulfillment of a University of Toronto Social Work degree.

New Provinces: Politics

The narrative of the production of *New Provinces* is an example of the articulation of gender and professionalization as it occurs in the feminization of social work. However, the political position-takings of Livesay and of those involved in the production of *New Provinces* must figure prominently in any consideration of the decision made by the volume's editors to exclude Livesay's socially engaged poetry. In the seventies, Livesay's memory of the alliances surrounding the production of *New Provinces* differs from my interpretation; she told Arnason, coeditor of *Right Hand Left Hand*, that Scott wanted her work in the collection and that Pratt vetoed the suggestion (Personal interview, July 16, 1997). Pratt's publication of Livesay's "Day and Night" in the January 1936 issue of *Canadian Poetry Magazine* raises a potential conflict of interest which may have led Livesay to believe that he was not anxious to see her poetry published in *New Provinces* in the same year. The archival letters contradict Livesay's memory, but her claim is a logical one, in view of the similarities between her political views and those of Scott. Of the poets published in *New Provinces*, Scott, Kennedy, and Klein were politically active. Pratt, Finch, and Smith focused on their scholarly, literary, and publishing activities. Brown has pointed out that Smith's "disgust with bourgeois values," is evident in his satirical poem, "Son and Heir," which appears in *News of the Phoenix* (1943) ("A.J.M. Smith and the Poetry of Pride" 85). Although Smith was critical of liberal and conservative social mores, his cynicism did not translate into social activism.

Others have made similar assumptions concerning Scott's role in the choices made about Livesay and *New Provinces*. Sandra Djwa believes that Smith was opposed to Livesay's inclusion in *New Provinces*. Djwa spoke to Smith at a Canadian literary conference in the seventies, and she reports that Smith "did not care for her [Livesay's] early political poetry" (E-mail to the author, October 27, 1997). However, Smith may have formed this opinion in retrospect. His 1934 letters to Scott do not criticize Livesay's work, and in spite of his criticism of Pratt's and Finch's writing, Smith agreed to their inclusion in *New Provinces*. He may have been unfamiliar with Livesay's current work at that time, but wanted to include it in order to make the anthology more representative of Canadian modernism. Djwa was also informed by Scott that Smith personally examined Scott's *New Provinces* file and removed some of his letters before the collection was sent to the National Archives. "Smith's original letter of objection may have gone," Djwa writes. "What you may have is Scott's echo" (October 27, 1997). However, it seems just as possible that Smith removed letters concerned with the rejected preface. Unfortunately, Smith is now deceased, and his papers do not contain the missing letters which might help to clarify these questions. My argument is based on the archival evidence which survives, that is, on the remaining correspondence between Scott and Smith, correspondence in which Smith suggests the inclusion of Livesay and Scott refuses.

Although the habituses of Livesay and Scott were formed by similar class, family, and religious environments, differences in their dispositions led them to choose different positions on the left. Both Livesay and Scott came from Anglican upper middle-class families and both were influenced by the Protestant tradition of social service. However, Scott's family more closely represents the establishment than does Livesay's. Scott's father, Canon F.G. Scott, played a major role in the formation of his son, who remained a church member. Livesay's father was an agnostic while her mother was an Anglican, and Livesay left her birth-family's church as a university student. She and Duncan were Unitarians. The difference in Livesay's and Scott's position-takings exemplifies Bourdieu's claim that his structuralist concept of the habitus is not deterministic; the agency of the subject-position allows him or her to choose differently than interpellation by ideological and environmental factors may indicate. Moreover, although both Livesay and Scott operated in the restricted field of literary production, they had very different literary roles and lifestyles, especially in the thirties. Scott was an established professor of law who was married and settled in Montreal, while Livesay was a single proletarian writer, journalist, organizer for the CPC, and social worker, who lived in Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver and several locations between Ontario and British Columbia. The differences between Livesay's and Scott's lifestyles resembles the difference between "professional writers" and "'proletaroid intellectuals'" outlined by Bourdieu in "The Field of Cultural Production":

> It is also clear that the opposition, within the 'autonomous' field, between

> professional writers, whose activity obliges them to lead an organized, regular, quasi-bourgeois life, and the 'bohemian' world of 'proletaroid intellectuals' who live on the odd jobs of journalism, publishing or teaching, may give rise to a political division.... (59)

It is my contention that a political division existed between Livesay and Scott, and that this political division was an important factor in Scott's decision-making during the production of *New Provinces*.

In *Right Hand Left Hand*, Livesay states that she "was a confirmed Marxist" in 1932, and by the time she moved to Montreal in 1933, she was also active in several Communist organizations: the Young Communist League, the Canadian League Against War and Fascism, the Canadian Labour Defense League, Friends of the Soviet Union, and the Workers' Unity League.[109] Livesay organized public meetings for the unemployed, gatherings which were broken up by the Montreal police in a deliberate campaign of harassment. Until the Quiet Revolution of the 1960s, Quebec was an anti-radical haven of conservatism; the Roman Catholic clergy had enormous influence in the fields of politics and education. Communism was anathema and socialism was not welcome. Furthermore, during the thirties and forties, sectors of the Canadian left competed for the support of trade union members, non-unionized agricultural and industrial workers, and sympathetic members of the middle class, and, according to historian Walter Young, the CCF and the CPC were actively competitive during this period (255). In 1922, the Soviet Comintern ordered Canadian communists to focus on the organization of a popular front against capitalism (Rodney 97). Although the CCF officially refused to cooperate with the CPC, which operated as the Labour Progressive Party (LPP) between 1943 and 1960, many CCF members took part in CPC and LPP popular front initiatives, such as the Housewives and Consumers League and the Canadian Peace Congress (Young 281).

Scott was politically motivated to avoid any alliance with Livesay for two reasons: his goal of establishing the CCF in Quebec and his academic career. For many years, Scott worked to increase the acceptance of the CCF in Quebec and was never successful. In both 1933 and 1934, different members of Quebec's clergy portrayed the CCF as a communist organization. In response, Scott and David Lewis wrote a CCF pamphlet which was designed to distinguish the CCF from the CPC (*New Endeavour* xxii). In addition, although Scott was a radical within the conservative field of law, he worked for social reforms from within the system, while Livesay challenged the fundamentals of hegemonic systems and worked outside them. In 1931, Scott publicly denounced the persecution of Communist meetings in Montreal; however, the satire of his concluding words functions both to ridicule the Montreal police and to separate him from Canadian communists:

> The method of our police is to make a stirring incident out of every meeting. What is the result? At the first meeting broken up some two hundred and fifty people were in attendance. At the last, over fifteen hundred attended. It would be interesting to know how many converts to communism have been made by this procedure. ("Letter to the Editor, *The Gazette* 1931" 4)

Second, Scott was warned by McGill's administration to separate his public activism from his academic position. He also had to contend with the public criticism of newspaper editors who believed that university faculty should not be involved in politics of any kind, whether pale pink or bright red (*New Endeavour* xxvi-xxvii). As a professional with a young family, Scott may have felt that he could not risk association either with a radical like Livesay or with her beliefs. For example, in 1934, the year in which *New Provinces* was edited, Scott used a pseudonym for his authorship of a strongly-worded article, "The Fascist Province," published in *The Canadian Forum*.[110] According to Michiel Horn, "Scott occasionally decided not to use his own name if he thought that an article he was publishing might strain his relations with the McGill Board of Governors unduly, or might cause difficulties for the university in its relations with the provincial government" (14). Horn claims that discrimination on the basis of political position-taking was systemic in Canadian universities of the period. In fact, McGill's teaching contracts with Eugene Forsey and Leonard Marsh, two LSR members, were cancelled in 1941 because of their left politics. Horn asserts that Scott was safe from such treatment because he "was a senior and tenured member of faculty" (xxvii). Scott became a full-time faculty member of the McGill law department in 1928 and achieved tenure well before this incident occurred; however, he did not advance within the university until late in his academic career. Scott became dean in 1961, only seven years before his retirement. Horn claims that academic disapproval of Scott's left politics held him back (*New Endeavour* xxvii). Public connections to communists such as Livesay would only have exacerbated the delicate balance between his academic career and his political commitments. Scott carefully positioned himself both in the field of power and in the field of cultural production to achieve his left and modernist goals without loss to the middle-class material reality of his life.

Scott was not alone in his strategy of separating political activism from aesthetic production. Kennedy did the same. At this time, a definite schism appears in Kennedy's professional writing. He published high modernist poetry such as appears in *The Shrouding* (1933), as well as low modernist prose concerned with social criticism, such as appears in *The Canadian Forum*.[111] Had Smith insisted on mingling the permutations of literary modernism by including Livesay's writing in *New Provinces*, he might have faced a united front from Scott and Kennedy. Livesay differed from her male colleagues in that her writing was an integral part of her activism on the left. During her most radical phase, that is, while she was a member of the CPC, she rejected modernist poetic form as bourgeois, and concentrated on proletarian writing. Furthermore, she rejected the CCF until she moved to Vancouver in 1936, met Duncan Macnair and was influenced by him to modify her radical politics and accept the pale pink socialism of the CCF.[112]

Livesay's papers reveal that she excluded Scott from plans for a memoir; she wrote: "Chapter VI: Montreal. My life as a social worker in the pre-war slum. The League against War and Fascism. Relationship with poets like Leo Kennedy, A. Smith, A.M. Klein; and critic Leon Edel. Poetry of protest" (U.Alberta 96-69, Queen's Box 2, File 20). Why did Livesay fail to mention Scott, an important organizer of this group of poets, unless they either were estranged during this period, or seldom interacted, either politically or aesthetically? Finally, in answer to my suggestion that perhaps Livesay herself did not want to be associated with the *New Provinces* poets, for political reasons of her own, Arnason states firmly that this was not the case. "In fact," he adds, "she was really pissed off" over her exclusion (July 16, 1997). Moreover, Livesay's papers reveal that she was pleased about Gnarowski's reissue of *New Provinces*. In 1976 she wrote a positive review of the book; her review ends as follows: "It is curious to consider that I was the only woman poet who was a contemporary of the six [poets in *New Provinces*], and publishing books alongside. Now there are dozens of women finding their voices in new anthologies" (UM Mss 37 Box 99 Fd 50). Some of those voices were found as a result of Livesay's own activities as an anthologist.

New Provinces: Gender

In addition to professional concerns and political differences, Livesay's exclusion from *New Provinces* was part of a systemic practice in the Canadian literary field. Discrimination on the basis of sex and the discursive devaluation of feminine literary themes were central to this practice. The power of misogynist discourses derives in part from their position in the doxa. As Toril Moi explains, doxa, the discourse of the establishment, functions to "make the `natural and social world appear as self-evident'" (1026). In masculinist cultures, misogyny is legitimate and those who speak a legitimated discourse have the power to wield symbolic violence in any field. But misogyny is itself the effect of an act of symbolic violence within the field of the doxic. Moi considers the production of gender to be an act of symbolic violence and symbolic violence to be "deeply doxic" (1029). "In other words," she writes, "to cast women as women is precisely to *produce* them as women. From a social perspective, without this categorizing and defining act of symbolic violence, women would simply not *be* women" (1036). The same principle applies to the sex/gender nexus of maleness/masculinity; men would not be men without the exposure of male children to the symbolic violence of masculinity. The combined ideological work of misogyny and the doxa has succeeded in naturalizing masculinity as positive and femininity as negative; this naturalization results in the imposition of negative or positive symbolic capital according to one's gender.

The case of Miriam Waddington exemplifies the systemic gender bias in the Canadian literary field. During the 1940s, her writing was devalued for its feminine content. In "Women and Writing," Waddington explains that, during her marriage, she wrote about "childbirth, love, work, and politics" (205). "These were hardly the kind of subjects to engage the interest of academic male critics," she adds. "In those days myth, distance, and so-called objectivity were all the rage" (205). Waddington identifies the life-path of most women writers, the combination of marriage, motherhood, and literature, as an impediment to the accumulation of symbolic power within the literary field. In "Bias," she writes:

> As it is, I have not founded any schools of poetry, have never been part of a group, have edited no magazines, have sought no disciples to interpret or promote me, and have not, as the sociologists say of men, 'bonded'. In short, I have achieved no kind of power except through the human response of either pleasure or the recognition of likeness that my work has evoked in others. (209)

Livesay was a public figure in the Canadian literary field from an early age, through her parents' literary connections, and she co-founded a literary magazine, but she experienced a marginalization similar to that described by Waddington. Although Livesay received the Jardine Memorial award for English Verse from the University of Toronto in 1927-28, she was excluded, on the basis of her sex, from the writers' club on campus. In 1936, she was excluded from *New Provinces*, and her ground-breaking work as co-founder of *Contemporary Verse* with Doris Ferne, Anne Marriott and Floris McLaren has not been fully acknowledged by literary critics. Pauline Butling "speculate[s]" that the "low profile [of *Contemporary Verse*] in recent histories of Canadian literary magazines" is related to the gender of its founders (in Gerson "The Canon Between the Wars" 208 note 32). George Woodcock's entry in the second edition of *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Literature* merely perpetuates this lack of recognition by attributing the founding of *Contemporary Verse* to its editor, Allan Crawley, whom Livesay, Ferne, Marriott, and McLaren merely "assisted...at various times," according to Woodcock (230). Even when operating within the public arena of literary production, performing tasks usually performed by men, the work of women literary producers earns little symbolic power. At the 1984 Longliners Conference, held at York University, Livesay commented on the perpetuation of gender discrimination in literary circles. Barbara Godard describes the context in "Epiprologue: In Pursuit of the Long Poem":

> Those excluded here [in the discussion at the conference] were those traditionally marginalized in English-Canadian criticism, immigrants, as Dennis Cooley pointed out regarding the short shrift given Prairie writing, Quebecois, as Fred Wah mentioned when referring to the work of Nicole Brossard, and women, as Dorothy Livesay interjected, underlining the men's club atmosphere of the critical establishment. (311)

Scott's satirical poem, "The Canadian Authors Meet," the canonization of which perpetuates the misogynist bias of the Canadian literary field, trivializes the writing of all Canadian women. Moreover, it represents both the battle of the sexes and the battle between literary movements. In "The Canadian Authors Meet," Scott attacks the Victorian tradition of nature poetry in British North America and genders it as feminine. He also attacks the romantic nationalism of canonized Canadian poets and infantilizes uncanonized women writers by mimicking nursery rhymes. As Gerson points out,

> women's writing was expected to conform to a Romantic/sentimental/domestic model. Those who followed suit and did not practise modernism were then easily dismissed and have disappeared from sight, while those who engaged with modernist methods were seldom taken as seriously as their male counterparts and have been consistently under-represented in the canon. ("The Canon between the Wars" 55)

The first version of Scott's poem, published in 1927 in the *McGill Fortnightly Review*, self-consciously locates the young male modernist in opposition to traditional poetic production. Scott writes:

> Far in the corner sits (though none would know it)
> The very picture of disconsolation.
> A rather lewd and most ungodly poet
> Writing these verses for his soul's salvation.
>
> (*McGill Fortnightly Review* 27 Apr. 1927: 73)

In subsequent collections of his poem, Scott omits these lines. According to Trehearne, this original ending reveals Scott's debt to modernism's precursor, Decadence, and the subsequent excision was meant to emphasize Scott's modernism over his early Decadence (170-171). In "The Canadian Authors Meet," Scott may have produced the most misogynist line in the history of Canadian literature when he described the members of the CAA as "Virgins of sixty who still write of passion" (*Selected Poems* 70). His misogyny is perhaps only surpassed by Ezra Pound, whose antifeminism and sexism is pointed out by Elliott and Wallace in "Professionalism, Genre, and the Sister(s') Arts" (95, 125).

Scott's misogynist poem was typical of masculinist values of a period when virile was an adjective used by critics to compliment a poet's work. In such misogynist conditions, the feminine becomes an epithet. Brown demeaned "the cosy things in life," which he perceived in abundance in the work of Edna Jaques and condemned her text, *My Kitchen Window*, as "mediocre" ("Canadian Poetry" 207). Saskatchewan-born Jaques was a prolific poet who published twelve collections of poetry over a long literary career. Donald Gordon, President of the Canadian National Railway (CNR), said once of Jaques, "What Robert Burns is to Scotland, Edna Jaques is to Canada" (*The Best of Edna Jaques* n.p). The poems in *My Kitchen Window* celebrate the private sphere, the daily household routine, farm life, and nature. Jaques' work is not modernist, metaphysical, aesthetic, or formally-experimental; she operated in the popular literature field by selling her work to newspapers and magazines for $1.50 per poem at the turn of the twentieth century.[113] Brown's condemnation of Jaques hinges not only on the opposition between the fields of popular literature and high art, but also on the rejection of the writing of women who operate within the popular field. In "Canadian Poetry," Brown admits that Jaques's work is well-received by the public; he writes, "The critic need concern himself with mediocre literature only when he has before him a book to which the reading public, or a substantial fraction of it, is disposed to assign a false importance. Mrs. Edna Jaques's *My Kitchen Window* is such a book" (206-207). It is unlikely that Brown would have suggested that Burns' poetry be removed from the canon of English Literature, yet Jaques's popular voice of western rural femininity cannot earn her a place in the canon of Canadian literature. Furthermore, the work of male Canadian poets whose poetry was also popular, such as Robert Service, has remained in the canon.

The corollary to Brown's denigration of the feminine and feminization of the popular appears in Logan's nationalist literary history, *Highways of Canadian Literature* (1924, 1928), in which domestic themes are considered appropriate for female writers.[114] Logan's text illustrates the claim by feminist theorists that nationalism is gendered; he expects female writers to focus on domestic themes and to express the nation's spiritual values of the day. Logan describes Jean Blewett as "a woman's poet" who "sings of the joys of home, the ways of children, the love of husband and wife" (220). In addition, Logan praises Pauline Johnson for the "passion, pathos, and womanly tenderness" displayed in her writing, which he describes as "fetching," and "daintily graphic and colorful and piquant and romantic" (195, 208). Furthermore, Logan does not give equal analytical attention to male and female writers. For instance, his classification of minor poets is dominated by thirteen women in a total of seventeen, and his analysis of minor Canadian poetry is asymmetrical, in favour of the few male poets who belong to the group, Francis Sherman, Albert E. S. Smythe, Arthur Stringer, and Peter McArthur.

Academic discourse of the period itself labours under gender stereotypes. Archibald MacMechan praised a colleague, "Professor Cappon of Queen's," for his "masculine judgment," apparently a pinnacle for which MacMechan also strove (118). However, devaluation of the feminine was not restricted to academic critics functioning in the restricted field of literary production. Deacon, who edited and wrote for popular magazines such as *Saturday Night*, praised Sir Charles G.D. Roberts for "set[ting] a virile and austere standard in both verse and prose" (*Poteen* 160). "His poetry is vigorous and polished," declares Deacon, "some of his lyrics and sonnets being as fine in thought and structure as any written in English in the '90's" (160). Deacon called Tom MacInnes "the virile master of his own variation of the old French ballade," and stated that Pratt's poetry "has fibre and pith, and his frequent humor is robust" (174-176). Simultaneously, Deacon perceived Pickthall to be "an exquisite lyricist at work weaving dainty, lace-like designs with great perfection of detail," and he asserted that "Canadian fiction was to go no lower" than Montgomery's Anne series, which he described as "sugary" (174, 169). Deacon's highly gendered language reveals the stereotyped expectations of many readers and reviewers of the period, expectations that conform to socially sanctioned gender roles, expectations that had material consequences for women writers who persisted in their feminine styles. For instance, Pratt, himself appreciative of `virile' poetry written by men or women, held a veto over the publication of Canadian women poets who submitted their work to the Macmillan publishing company in the 1930s, a period during which Pratt acted as reader and advisor to Eayrs. The work of Doris Ferne, Livesay's colleague on *Contemporary Verse*, was rejected by Eayrs because Pratt criticized it for lack of virility. Ferne responded to Eayrs, "he [Pratt] does not care for work that is light and delicate, and after all everyone does not want red meat" (Gerson "The Canon between the Wars" 54).

As I have pointed out, Pratt praised Livesay's low modernist poem "West Coast" for its masculinity. In addition, *Day and Night* (1944) was described as "the mature work of a virile exponent of modern Canadian poetry" by reviewer M.V. Thornton (UM Mss 37 Box 18 Fd 3 np nd). On the other hand, in his review of *Day and Night*, Scott emphasizes the personal as a feminine attribution and describes Livesay's writing as "sentimental" and "sensitive" rather than "tough" (23). About "Lorca" he writes:

> Here her delicate touch can express the essence of the tragedy [of Lorca's murder] without needing to attempt the bolder and more masculine statement which the themes of *The Outrider* and *Day and Night* seem to require. In these, while the social passion is keenly felt, the vehicle is a little fragile. (24)

In a milieu of systemic devaluation of the feminine, a devaluation which is perpetuated by editors such as Scott, a woman who wrote in "new and forceful expressions" would inevitably have faced exclusion from *New Provinces* ten years earlier (Thornton np nd).

Although Scott's criticism of Livesay's *Day and Night* follows the gendered viewpoint of earlier male critics, the conclusion to his 1945 review indicates that he has included Livesay in the modernist group from which she was excluded by him in 1934. "The Ryerson Press is to be complimented on the standards achieved in its first three volumes in this series," he writes. "Birney's *David*, Smith's *News of the Phoenix* and

Livesay's *Day and Night* mark the arrival of a new period in Canadian poetry" (24). Livesay was active as a modernist poet as early as any of the male Montreal group, but it took ten years for her male peers to publicly acknowledge her work, in spite of recognition from the Canadian literary establishment. Furthermore, Scott includes Birney (1904-1995) in the same artistic generation as Smith and Livesay, even though Birney's poetry was published ten years after Livesay's. By 1939 Livesay was co-editing a book of Canadian literature with Kennedy (Kennedy to Scott July 13, 1939), and by 1942 her name was entrenched in Smith's plans for anthologies (Smith to Scott January 13 & 22, 1942). Livesay belongs in the middle generation of Canadian modernist poets, with the *New Provinces* group, not with the third generation of modernists, represented by the younger (except for Scott) founders of *Preview* and *First Statement*. Her gender, lack of professional status, and radical political activism contributed to her neglect by that exclusively male group.

Anthology Survey

A situation of systemic discrimination on the basis of gender within the Canadian literary field, a situation which contributed to Livesay's exclusion from *New Provinces*, suggests that few female poets are included in other anthologies of the period. To test this hypothesis, I analyzed the content of thirty-eight anthologies produced between 1923 and 1957.[115] I discovered that two of Livesay's poems, "Winter" (1938) and "The Child Looks Out" (1938),[116] were most frequently chosen by anthology editors; they appear in four of the seven anthologies which publish Livesay's poetry.[117] The content of these two modernist poems is more domestic than other poetry written by Livesay in this period. In "Winter," Livesay uses a season as a metaphor for the Great Depression and society's ills. "The Child Looks Out" is written in a mother's voice, a mother who considers the predicament of a child struggling with discovery in an adult world of symbolism, disillusion, and war. Two-thirds of the editors who chose these two poems as representative of Livesay's work were male.

Besides gender, many of the elements which I have considered throughout this dissertation surface in this group of texts: nationalism, internationalism, modernism, ethnicity, and artistic generation. In addition, the popular-literature/pure-art dichotomy articulates with the two major groups that emerge from my analysis: anthologies produced by individual editors and those produced by associations. The individual editors are mainly male academics or professional writers; I have called this group the academic-professional group. Besides academic-professional anthologies, most of which were produced by established publishing companies, two national writers' associations produced poetry anthologies in this time period: the CAA and the Writers' Craft Club.[118]

The association anthologies represent a complex position in the field. On the one hand, in comparison to the academic-professional anthologies, which were the products of private negotiations between established publishing companies and a writer or academic, the association anthologies were produced through a more public and bureaucratic process. Most of the association volumes were published by branches of the CAA, and the poems in these volumes were compiled from the results of national or regional poetry competitions. Two levels of gate-keepers operate in this competitive process, the editors and the judges. Although most editors, in both groups of anthologies, were male, association anthologies were edited by both women and men. Harrington's historical work on the CAA reveals that there were only three editors of the *Alberta Poetry Yearbook* in fifty years, all of whom were women (249-250). During the same period, despite the female-dominated membership of the CAA, the judges who chose the contents of the yearbooks were male (250). In the case of the Alberta CAA, the division of labour for the association's poetry publications follows the gendered divisions within masculinist systems of power. Judging a poetry contest consisting of hundreds of entries is a difficult task, but it places the judge in a more powerful position than that of editor, a position which involves mundane work. As June Fritch, one of the long-term editors of the *Alberta Poetry Yearbook*, comments, "the most devoted woman wearies of this expenditure of her time and talent" (250). In addition, the volunteer work of the judges is acknowledged in print in the association anthologies, usually in a preface or foreword, whereas most editors are unnamed. *Border Voices*, edited by Carl Eayrs in 1946, and *Voices of Victory* (1941), in which Livesay's "The Child Looks Out" appears, constitute the two exceptions to this rule. The editorial board of *Voices of Victory* consisted of three men and one woman and its judges were all male.[119] The preponderance of female writers in association anthologies, including those both edited and judged by male writers, suggests the articulation of gender with democracy, that is, with the power of numbers; most of the submissions to the poetry contests of association anthologies were from women writers, a fact that reflects the female domination of the CAA's membership lists.

The association volumes garner little cultural capital, are deemed to be vanity publishing, and have little opportunity to enter the canon. In his Preface to the 1928-29 *Poetry Year Book* of the Montreal Branch of the CAA, Leo Cox mentions the difficulty of "earning a living" and writing at the same time (iii). The purpose of this association anthology was to support the production of poetry in Canada by offering prizes of $10 to $25 and the publication of the winning poems. The monetary prizes contributed to the professionalization of the literary vocation. The CAA's Ottawa branch also wanted "to provide one more outlet for Canadian writers" by publishing *Profile: A Chapbook of Canadian Verse* in 1946 (v). However, all poetry publication in Canada, whether written by men or women, amounted to vanity publishing, including those volumes which were published by established publishing companies, such as *New Provinces* and Livesay's *Green Pitcher* (1928) and *Signpost* (1932). The devaluation of association anthologies is closely connected to the feminization of both popular literature and Victorian stylistics, as well as to the upside-down economic character of the literary field. The genre of poetry belongs to the restricted arena where literature is not expected to garner financial rewards, but female authorship, feminine content, and Victorian stylistics devalue the CAA's poetry publications. Contradictorily, the academic-professional anthologies, many of which were published as textbooks, stood to earn more profits for their publishers than did the association anthologies, and the writers included in the textbook anthologies earned cultural capital by entering the canon through the curriculum.[120] This contradiction in the field rests on a complex foundation marked by gender and perpetuated through a constructed canon. The mostly female writers who were published in the association anthologies were excluded from more widely distributed, more canonically powerful poetry anthologies.

When the association and academic-professional groups of anthologies are considered separately, this gender-based dichotomy is clearly evident: the percentage of women writers included in the academic-professional anthologies, twenty-seven percent, is less than half of the corresponding figure for the association anthologies, sixty-eight percent (See Table 3). In addition, the poetry anthologies issued by the associations allocate the most space to female poets, ranging from thirty-four to ninety percent of pages, while women's writing in the academic-professional anthologies occupies from four to thirty-four percent of the total number of pages. For example, fourteen percent of the writers published in the academic-professional anthology *A Book of Canadian Prose and Verse* (*BCPV* 1923) are female, yet the writing of these four women occupies only seven percent of the text (See Table 1).[121] The much larger amount of textual space allotted to women in association anthologies suggests that when women have control of the material resources necessary for literary production, their published work reflects their numbers, even when they assign positions of power, such as adjudication, to men. In the three editions of Smith's canonical *Book of Canadian Poetry* (1943, 1948, 1957), women writers constitute from fourteen to seventeen percent of the total number of writers. Gerson has noted that Smith gradually eliminated early Canadian women writers from successive editions of the anthology, until only two of seven remained ("Anthologies and the Canon" 61). According to 1941 Census statistics, female authors, editors and journalists who earned a wage for their writing comprised eighteen percent of the total number of wage-earning authors, editors and journalists. In the 1931 census, this figure was fourteen percent.[122] Drawing on Anne Dagg's research, Gerson states that "In English Canada, from the beginnings to 1950, women have represented 40 per cent of the authors of books of fiction and 37 per cent of the authors of books of poetry" ("Anthologies and the Canon..." 57). Clearly, although women were being published, most female writers did not earn an income for their writing, a fact that relates to several factors: the gendering of genres and the corresponding differences in valuation, the upside-down economic system within the field of cultural production, and differences in male and female writers' access to gatekeeping positions (57). Newspaper and magazine editors, as well as editors and publishers of anthologies and monographs, function as gate-keepers and are usually male (57). The large difference between the number of women published in anthologies and the number of women reporting earnings for their publications sheds reasonable doubt on the assumption of census compilers that either eighteen or fourteen percent accurately reflects the proportion of women among Canadian writers in this period. Many writers of both sexes earned a wage at another occupation, as did Livesay, or earned so little income from writing that it need not have been declared.

Only two of the eighteen academic-professional anthologies are edited by women, while the male editor of a third was assisted by a woman (See Table 1). Ethel Hume Bennett's anthology, *New Harvesting*, includes thirty-four percent of women writers while Margaret Fairley's *Spirit of Democracy* has only ten percent, one of the lowest percentages of women authors in the entire group of anthologies. This vast difference may be explained by the nature of each woman's anthology. Fairley's is a collection of poems and excerpts from the prose of writers in Canada from 1632 to 1945. Besides the long time-line, Fairley's collection focuses on politics, a masculine field which excludes most women during the time periods covered in her collection. Furthermore, Fairley draws from a wide range of textual material, including letters, political manifestos, autobiography, fiction, journalism, essays, and poetry, a range which tends to overwhelm genres which have been gendered as feminine in different periods, including the period under discussion, such as the novel, the diary, and the memoir. Bennett's anthology, on the other hand, covers a much shorter time period, 1918-1938, and is restricted to one genre of writing, poetry, which is gendered masculine and deemed to be high art. Finally, Alan Creighton, editor of *A New Canadian Anthology*, lists Hilda M. Ridley, a member of the Toronto branch of the CAA, as his assistant. Among the academic-professional anthologies, this product of a male-female collaboration contains a relatively high proportion of female poets, seventy-five percent. The lack of women editors among academic-professional anthologies in this survey is evidence of systemic discrimination on the basis of sex and the power of the symbolic violence of gender, factors that relate to a gendered imbalance of financial and cultural power.

The association/academic-professional dichotomy articulates with artistic generation and with the popular-literature/literary- writing debate which underlies the Victorian-modernist split. These articulations appear within two other trends which characterize the anthologies I am considering. First, with regard to the Victorian-modernist split, the anthologies fall into three groups: those which restrict themselves to modernist literary work, such as *Other Canadians (OC)* and *Canadian Accent (CA)*; those which restrict themselves to Victorian literary production, such as most of the CAA's *Poetry Year Books*; and those which publish some combination of both, such as *Canadian Poets (CP)*, *The Book of Canadian Poetry*, *A New Canadian Anthology (NCA)*, and some of the CAA's publications. Second, among the modernist anthologies, editors use literary generation as a criterion for inclusion and exclusion. Although Livesay's modernist poetry was new in 1928, and she continued to produce modernist poetry in 1946, Sutherland and Gustafson exclude her on the basis of literary generation within the modernist movement. In addition, the anthologies that self-identify as modernist also show a gendered differential in the allottment of printed space. Most modernist anthologies are not only edited by men, but also contain less literary work by female writers than by male writers. For instance, although twenty-two percent of the poets in Sutherland's *Other Canadians* are women, these female poets' work occupies only eleven percent of the pages in the anthology. In Gustafson's second anthology, *Canadian Accent* (1944), women writers comprise thirteen percent of the selected writers and their writing comprises ten percent of the volume. Livesay's work appears in neither anthology.

Sutherland's and Gustafson's exclusion of Livesay's work highlights her membership in the second artistic generation of Canadian modernist poets, the generation of the thirties; she is more established than the Gustafson and Sutherland generation. At the same time, her exclusion on the basis of artistic generation exemplifies the process by which anthologists support their colleagues in their struggle to enter the literary canon. The Gustafson and Sutherland anthologies endeavour to create a space in the field of Canadian modernist literary production for the forties' modernist generation; the exclusion of the previous generation of modernist poets is one means by which the next generation asserts its difference and begins to accumulate cultural capital. Bennett's *New Harvesting* (*NH* 1938), on the other hand, which publishes both modernist and non-modernist poetry, allots the second-largest amount of space to Livesay's work; only E.J. Pratt's writing takes up more pages in this volume.

Within the context of this anthology survey, Livesay's accumulation of cultural capital is expressed by the invitation she received from the editors of *Voices of Victory* (1941) to publish "The Child Looks Out" in their anthology. On the basis of their literary successes, a select group of poets, including Pratt, Gibbon, Brown, Hale, Stringer, Benson, Bourinot, Kennedy, and Livesay, were excluded from competing with the newcomers who entered the national poetry contest. In the foreword, the editors of *Voices of Victory* state: "Canadian poets who are widely recognized as established craftsmen were invited to contribute to this collection. Their response was ready and cordial" (v-vi). However, Livesay's entry into the canon was not assured by inclusion in a publication of the devalued CAA. The higher valuation of modernism and postmodernism in our historical moment means that contemporary readers are less likely to open a CAA production and more likely to turn to Gustafson's and Sutherland's anthologies, where Livesay's work does not appear. As a modernist herself, Livesay struggled with the CAA, both as a member and a non-member, yet, as a woman writer whose work was being culled from anthologies produced by the next artistic generation, she was bound to accept publication elsewhere.

Ethnicity, narrowly defined here by the inclusion of non-English-language writing, hardly appears at all in this group of anthologies. Two association anthologies and one academic anthology are the exceptions. *A Book of Canadian Prose and Verse* (1923) contains six untranslated poems by Louis Fréchette, occupying eight pages. Fréchette's work is followed by a poetic tribute from John Reade, titled "To Louis Fréchette / On the occasion of his poems being crowned by the French Academy" (49). In his poem, Reade describes French- and English-Canadians as "one great race to be," because both descend from Bretons and Normans (49). In keeping with the nationalist view of the role of literature in nation building, verse is here used to call for the unity of two ethnicities, based on similarities in genealogical histories. In addition, the poet's reference to the French Academy gestures simultaneously toward the cultural cringe of colonial writers and to the importance of language as a marker of an ethnic group.

Profile: A Chapbook of Canadian Verse (1946) and the *Manitoba Poetry Chapbook* (*MPC* 1933) provide the other two examples of attention to ethnicity among the thirty-eight anthologies surveyed. *Profile* was produced by the Ottawa branch of the CAA and it contains one French-Canadian poem by Marie Sylvia. The *Manitoba Poetry Chapbook*, containing poems in French, German, Ukrainian, Swedish, and Yiddish, is much more extensively an ethnic co-production. The Manitoba branch of the CAA held a poetry contest that was open to Manitoban poets of all languages. All three of the judges were English-Canadian academics, and the winning poems were written in English and Icelandic. In the Preface, Watson Kirkconnell, who also served as a judge of the entries, emphasizes the difficulties of publishing a small volume in several languages and the importance of cooperation to the success of the project. According to Kirkconnell, Winnipeg's "foreign language presses," including the publisher, the Israelite Press, worked together to produce the volume (4). Kirkconnell concludes:

> The result is a volume quite unique in the history of Canadian poetry. Manitoba is a province of fifty languages, and we hope that this chapbook may convey to other parts of the Dominion some hint of the rich and varied potentialities inherent in this mingling of cultures throughout the years to come. (4)

Both Kirkconnell and Broadus and Broadus assume the existence of an unproblematized mosaic or the desirability of a unified nation. Throughout his academic career, Kirkconnell, a poet and translator, worked towards an acceptance of Northern-European and East-European immigrants by Anglo-Saxon Canadians. His translations of poetry by Icelandic-, Swedish-, Hungarian-, Italian-, Greek-, Ukrainian-, and French-Canadians into English were designed to promote a recognition among English-speaking Canadians of the variety of ethnic cultural groups in the Canadian literary field (Craig 598). According to N.F. Dreisziger, Kirkconnell "anticipated the concept of government-supported multicultural programmes by some four decades" (94).

In spite of Kirkconnell's avowed opposition to assimilation, the production of the *Manitoba Poetry Chapbook* may be used by the state to support its claims that multicultural equality exists in Canada. In such a case, a federal state's interest in a unified nation is advanced by the work of the dominated fraction of the dominant class, such as employees of the postsecondary educational system, as were Kirkconnell and Edmund Broadus. For example, according to Terrence Craig, Kirkconnell wrote *Canadians all: a primer of national unity* (1940), in order to "reassure Canadians of the loyalty of these immigrants in wartime" (598).[123] Kirkconnell's major role in the production of the *Manitoba Poetry Chapbook* must be seen in light of the project to which he dedicated himself only seven years later, a project in which Craig discursively juxtaposes a homogeneous group of white Anglo-Saxon Canadians to a homogeneous group of immigrants. The slight number of anthologies containing non-English writing suggests that, although a few members of the field addressed Canada's ethnic diversity, these efforts were anomalies in the English-language Canadian literary field of the period. Furthermore, the predominance of white Anglo-Canadian writers in this field creates a power imbalance in which non-white, non-Anglo writers function as exotic Others, just as women function as Others in masculinist societies. Such a representation of ethnicity both stems from and perpetuates racialization. At the same time, these anthologies challenge the aspirations to ethnic and racial homogeneity within English-language Canada. However, Broadus' and Broadus' hope that their anthology will contribute to understanding and unity among Canada's regions suggests that assumptions concerning the desirability of homogeneity are not far below the surface of their rhetoric (viii).

The themes of nationalism and internationalism also intersect with both the association and academic-professional anthologies. Many association anthologies were produced with nationalist aims. For instance, the *Alberta Poetry Year Book* of 1930/31, one of the few in which the majority of the judges are female,[124] begins with an introduction by Evelyn Gowan Murphy in which she foregrounds nationalism and regionalism:

The motive which prompted the Edmonton Branch of the Canadian Authors'

> Association to sponsor a poetry competition among the residents of Alberta was a desire to inspire Canadian writers to make use of the vast wealth of western Canadian material which lies before them and to awaken in Canadians, through the medium of verse, a deeper patriotism and interest in their own country. ("The Prize Contests" 5)

Murphy was disappointed "that the percentage of poems with a distinctive Canadian motif or background were much in the minority" among the submissions (5). The nationalist motivation of these anthologies is grounded in the nineteenth-century notion of the importance of a national literature to a nation's strength. Moreover, the organization, by a predominantly female association, of national or regional poetry contests around a patriotic theme exemplifies one way in which women fulfill their assigned role of cultural arbiters and conduits. The conjunction of nationalism in the public discourse with gendered stereotypes surrounding women as physical and cultural reproducers naturalizes the promotion of nationalist poetry and the editing and production of nationalist poetry yearbooks as a feminine activity. The paradoxical corollary to this gendering of literary spaces lies in the delegitimization that feminization entails, a double standard which marks the Canadian literary field as masculinist.

An extension of this double standard is evident in the fact that nationalist literary productions edited by men are more likely to circulate in the literary field as legitimized school textbooks. *A Pocketful of Canada* (*PC* 1946), edited by John D. Robins, professor of literature at the University of Toronto, represents nationalism in the textbook subsection of the academic-professional group. The volume was sponsored by the Canadian Council of Education for Citizenship and the Council's chair, H.M. Tory, wrote the introduction. "This ever-increasing accumulation of the written word constitutes the source material from which, after diligent searching, an understanding of the spirit of a nation may be derived," writes Tory (v). The phrase, "the spirit of a nation" is typical of the Christian bent to public discourse of the period. Although Robins states that "the book is not intended as an anthology," he does create a textbook which Tory hopes "will appeal to the boys and girls who are in the process of learning to love this land of ours" (xiii, vi). Assimilation of youth is the assurance of a legacy of nationalism, and this textbook, prepared by a member of the dominated fraction of the dominant class, furthers a central government's hopes for the persistence of a federal nationalism. The black and white photographs included in the volume, provided by the National Film Board and grouped under captions such as "The Conquest of Space" and "National Events," exemplify a masculine and centralist construction of Canada. For example, the national events depicted are a hockey game in Maple Leaf Gardens and a debate in the House of Commons, both almost exclusively masculine fields of endeavour.

While nationalist sentiments appear in both association and academic-professional anthologies, internationalism is restricted to the academic-professional group. George Herbert Clarke's *New Treasury of War Poetry* (*NTWP* 1943) arguably exhibits the most prominent tendency toward internationalism of all the anthologies under discussion. This volume is organized by the names of several countries, all members of the Allied nations, as well as by themes related to war. In the introduction, Clarke states, "This anthology attempts a poetic survey of the objective deeds and experiences of the United Nations and of their subjective defences and advances as well" (xxxiii). Clarke, an academic, treats English as an international language and the *New Treasury of War Poetry* functions as propaganda for the Allied cause in WWII. Most poems in this collection glorify war and the soldier's role, at the same time as they vilify Nazism; thus, democracy and gender stereotypes are both upheld by literary production. In an attempt at homogeneity that was considered essential during the war periods, Clarke describes the poets both as "one in spirit and intention," and "united" (xxxiv).

An example of the articulation of internationalism and nationalism appears in Stephen's *The Golden Treasury of Canadian Verse* (*GTCV* 1928). In the introduction, Stephen expresses the imperialist nationalism of his historical period and the belief in the importance of literature to the development of "a national spirit and consciousness" (vii). He writes, "If it be true that Canadians are not familiar with the work of the writers who have given to them a national soul and spirit, then it is our immediate duty to correct this defect in our development. Herein lies the reason for the publication of the *Golden*

Treasury of Canadian Verse"(vii). However, Stephen is also proud of the comments of a vettor concerning his successful application of international standards to the anthology (vii). Stephen quotes the vettor's words, identified only as "a prominent educator," in his introduction: "The poems, while Canadian in spirit, possess the universal quality of poetry which would be recognised as such by critics outside of our country. I have been a little surprised to find that there is so much good poetry of Canadian origin" (vii-viii). Stephen's support for international literary standards articulates with colonial-imperialism in that he praises Canada for "carr[ying] forward the great traditions of English literature," and "produc[ing] poets worthy to rank with those who are the glory of Britain" (viii). The *Anthology of Canadian Poetry* (*ACP* 1942) is also identified with international literary standards. In the preface, the editor, Gustafson, is critical of the boosterism of Canadian cultural nationalists. "[I]t was forgotten that Canadianism is not necessarily a poem. But that has been outgrown," he claims (v). In his second anthology, *Canadian Accent* (1944), Gustafson published Leon Edel's essay, "The Question of Canadian Identity," in which Edel positions himself against Canadian nationalists. *Canadian Accent* excludes writers or articles which promote Canadian literature, and provides an example of the way in which the political stances of anthologists, at all points of the national-international debate, have material results in the field of cultural production.

If my survey can be taken as a reasonably accurate snapshot of the field, poetry writing in Canada during this period is largely Victorian and nationalist. Our historical period's interest in the literary production of internationalism, as expressed by modernism and postmodernism, has led contemporary literary critics, such as Norris, Dudek, and Gnarowski, to inaccurately and anachronistically emphasize the prevalence and weight of modernism in the Canadian literary field of 1920-1950. Furthermore, the findings of the survey confirm my hypothesis that gender figures largely in the decisions made by anthologists. Not only do the academic-professional anthologies include fewer women, they allow even less space to their women writers than is implied by the male-female ratio of their choices (See Table 3). In addition, the popular-literature/pure-art dichotomy, as represented here by the feminization of the CAA and the masculinization of modernist writing, delegitimizes the literary production of writers who contribute to Victorian association anthologies and elevates those whose work appears in academic-professional anthologies. Moreover, within this group of English-Canadian anthologies, the ethnicity of Canadian writers is virtually ignored. Finally, these markers of the process of anthologization are perpetuated by the inclusion of academic-professional anthologies in the literary and curricular canons, and the concurrent exclusion of association anthologies. Thus, the production of anthologies impacts on the formation of a canon.

In conclusion, I want to point to the usefulness, especially within educational discursive communities, of analyzing canons. As Lauter states, discussions of canons assist in "reconstructing historical understanding to make it inclusive and explanatory instead of narrowing and arbitrary" (456). Lauter's point resonates with Catharine Stimpson's description of the three articulated zones within which canon debates occur:

> At the first level is the opening up the canon to include works that have been irresponsibly excluded; at the second level is the study of the process of canon formation, for example, the kind John Guillory does; and the third is the questioning of greatness and universals...all three of those levels have been operating simultaneously. (in Brooks et al 387)

The exclusion of women's writing from anthologies, the exclusion of association anthologies from canons, and the exclusion of popular literature from curricular and institutional canons exemplify the steps outlined by Stimpson. Livesay's literary experiences, both as a poet in relation to *New Provinces* (1936) and as an anthologist in the 1970s, provide particular instances of the first two steps. My survey of thirty-eight anthologies provides a base from which to develop the third step, "the questioning of greatness and universals" (387).

Anthologies Included in Survey

Alberta Poetry Year Book. Edmonton: CAA, 1930, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1951, 1952.

Anthology of Canadian Poetry. Ed. Ralph Gustafson. Toronto: Penguin, 1942.

The Book of Canadian Poetry (First, Second and Third Editions). Ed. A.J.M. Smith. Toronto: Gage, 1943, 1948, 1957.

A Book of Canadian Prose and Verse. Eds. E.K. and E.H. Broadus. Toronto: Macmillan, 1923.

Border Voices: A Collection of Poems. Ed. Carl Eayrs. Windsor: CAA, 1946.

Canadian Accent: A Collection of Stories and Poems by Contemporary Writers from Canada. Ed. Ralph Gustafson. New York: Penguin, 1944.

Canadian Poems. Calgary: CAA, 1937.

Canadian Poets. Ed. John W. Garvin.Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1926, 1930.

Canadian Voices and Others: Poems Selected for the Classroom. Ed. A.M. Stephen. Toronto: Dent, 1934.

The Golden Treasury of Canadian Verse. Ed. A.M. Stephen. Toronto: Dent, 1928

Manitoba Poetry Chapbook. Ed. Watson Kirkconnell. Winnipeg: Israelite Press and the CAA, 1933.

Modern Canadian Poetry. Ed. Nathaniel A. Benson. Ottawa: Graphic, 1930.

A New Canadian Anthology. Eds. Alan Creighton, Hilda M. Ridley. Toronto: Crucible Press, 1938.

New Harvesting: Contemporary Canadian Poetry 1918-1938. Ed. Ethel Hume Bennett. Toronto: Macmillan, 1938.

The New Treasury of War Poetry: Poems of the Second World War. Ed. George Herbert Clarke. Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1943.

Other Canadians: An Anthology of the New Poetry in Canada 1940-1946. Ed. John Sutherland. [Montreal: First Statement Press, 1947.]

Poetry (Chicago) Canadian Number 58.2 (April 1941) Ed. E.K. Brown.

A Pocketful of Canada. Ed. John D. Robins. Toronto: Collins, 1946.

Poetry Year Book. Montreal: CAA, 1928-29, 1929-30, 1930-31, 1939, 1940.

Profile: A Chapbook of Canadian Verse. Ottawa: CAA, 1946.

A Sheaf of Verse. Eds. The Writers' Craft Club. Toronto: Ryerson, 1929.

Spirit of Canadian Democracy: A Collection of Canadian Writings from the Beginnings to the Present Day. Ed. Margaret Fairley. Toronto, Progress, [1945].

Twentieth Century Canadian Poetry. Ed. Earle Birney. Toronto: Ryerson, 1953.

Unit of Five. Ed. Ronald Hambleton. Toronto: Ryerson, 1944.

Voices of Victory: Representative Poetry of Canada in War-time. Eds. CAA Toronto. Toronto: Macmillan, 1941.

Yearbook of the Arts in Canada 1928-1929, and 1936. Ed. B. Brooker. Toronto: Macmillan, 1929, 1936.

TABLE 1

ACADEMIC-PROFESSIONAL ANTHOLOGIES, 1923-1957

TITLE	SEX OF EDITOR	TOTAL WRITERS AND ARTISTS	TOTAL WOMEN	WOMEN AS PERCENT TOTAL[1]	TOTAL PAGES	PAGES BY WOMEN	WOMEN'S PAGES AS % TOTAL
ACP[2]	Male	56	14	25	114	15	13
Book of Canadian Poetry	Male	1943: 76 1948: 65 1957: 73	1943: 21 1948: 14 1957: 18	1943: 27 1948: 21 1957: 24	1943:432 1948:462 1957:504	1943: 72 1948: 67 1957: 87	1943:16 1948:14 1957:17
BCPV	M &F	29	4	14	390	27	7
CA	Male	23	3	13	142	14	10
CP	Male	75	29	38	530	143	27
CVO	Male	54	16	29	147	29	20
GTCV	Male	25	10	40	146	29	20
MCP	Male	20	6	30	227	54	24
NCA	M&F	99	75	57	236	73	31
NH	Female	45	19	42	192	66	34
NTWP	Male	106	25	23	261	45	17
OC	Male	18	4	22	112	12	11
PC	Male	108	21	19	421	46	11
Poetry	Male	13	5	38	33	11	33
SCD	Female	174	15	8	281	28	10
TCCP	Male	70	19	27	127	24	19
Unit Five	Male	5	1	20	87	14	16
Yearbook of Arts	Male	1929: 77 1936:144	1929: 12 1936: 30	1929: 15 1936: 21	1929:307 1936:256	1929: 12 1936: 72	1929: 4 1936:28

TABLE 2

ASSOCIATION ANTHOLOGIES, 1929-1952

TITLE	SEX OF EDITORS AND/OR JUDGES[1]	TOTAL WRITERS	TOTAL WOMEN	WOMEN as PERCENT TOTAL WRITERS	TOTAL PAGES	PAGES BY WOMEN	WOMEN'S PAGES AS % TOTAL
Alberta Poetry Year Book	2 F; 1 M 2 Male 2 Male 2 Female 2 M, 1 F 2 Male	1930: 18 1941: 53 1942: 68 1943: 55 1951: 60 1952: 72	11 39 52 43 42 56	61 73 76 78 70 77	25 43 45 39 66 69	16 34 32 27 43 44	64 79 71 69 65 63
Border Voices	Male	10	9	90	48	43	90
Canadian Poems	Male	35	17	48	41	24	58
MPC	Male	26	11	42	32	11	34
Poetry Year Book	Male	1928:30 1929:31 1930:40 1939:32 1940:24	1928: 18 1929: 22 1930: 28 1939: 18 1940: 18	1928:60 1929:70 1930:70 1939:56 1940:75	1928:50 1929:43 1930:49 1939:41 1940:34	1928: 25 1929: 31 1930: 36 1939: 20 1940: 23	1928:50 1929:72 1930:73 1939:49 1940:67
Profile	Unknown	26	19	73	47	25	53
Sheaf of Verse	Unknown	18	16	88	20	18	90
Voices of Victory	Male: 3 Female:1	67	35	52	94	47	50

TABLE 3

SUMMARY

TYPE OF ANTHOLOGY	NUMBER OF VOLUMES	TOTAL WRITERS	TOTAL WOMEN	WOMEN AS % TOTAL WRITERS	TOTAL PAGES	PAGES BY WOMEN	WOMEN'S PAGES AS % TOTAL
ASSOC.	17	665	454	68	786	499	63
ACADEMIC/ PROFESS.	21	1349	366	27	5407	940	17

Notes To Tables

1. All numbers over .75 have been rounded off to the next highest number.

2. Following are the full titles for abbreviations used in Tables 1 to 3:

ACP: Anthology of Canadian Poetry
ASSOC.: Association
BCPV: Book of Canadian Prose and Verse
CA: Canadian Accent
CP: Canadian Poets
F: Female
GTCV: Golden Treasury of Canadian Verse
M: Male
MCP: Modern Canadian Poetry
MPC: Manitoba Poetry Chapbook
NCA: New Canadian Anthology
NH: New Harvesting
NTWP: New Treasury of War Poetry
OC: Other Canadians
PC: Pocketful of Canada
PROFESS.: Professional
SCD: Spirit of Democracy
TCCP: Twentieth Century Canadian Poetry

See Appendix A for an alphabetical list of anthologies by title. Each anthology is also listed in the Bibliography by Editor.

3. In most anthologies, editors are unidentified and judges are identified. In some anthologies, neither are identified.

Concluding Remarks:
Material Agents in a Material World

When I began to write *A Materialist-Feminist Analysis of Dorothy Livesay, Madge Macbeth, and the Canadian Literary Field of 1920-1950*, I had hoped to analyze the entire field, using Livesay and Macbeth as focal points, but I have only succeeded in hinting at its contours. By focusing on women writers in general and on Livesay and Macbeth in particular, I have, of course, been selective. Furthermore, my selection of these two women writers has shaped the direction of my enquiry by suggesting the exploration of certain issues in the field: cultural nationalism, literary standards, modernism, the popular-literature/literary-writing dichotomy, and discrimination on the bases of class, gender, race, and ethnicity. The premise of this project, that much of Canadian literary history is based on masculinist assumptions, is substantiated by the dynamics of the literary field between 1920 and 1950. The marginalization of Canadian writers according to gender was just as systemic in that time period as was the delegitimization of popular literature by canonical gate-keepers. Both of these exclusionary strategies depend upon questions surrounding professionalization and gender. The literary field articulates with professionalism at every level. Publication, awards, a place in the canon: all depend upon a writer's professional status, which, in turn depends partly on the status of the genre in which she or he works. Despite her career as a professional writer, Macbeth was doubly marginalized because she was a woman writer operating entirely in the popular literature sector. Livesay's larger accrual of cultural capital, in conjunction with both the lasting interest of literary critics in modernist literature and the modernist nature of the literary canon, has led to the inclusion of her poetry in anthologies and on academic curricula. During the period I have examined here, Macbeth's writing was more accessible through the literary marketplace than was Livesay's. The loss of Macbeth's work to subsequent generations of readers and the inclusion of Livesay's writing in evaluative anthologies indicates the power of canon-makers. Choices made by literary critics, postsecondary educational institutions, and cultural agencies result in differences in accessibility to literary legacies, that is, in a constructed canon.

The anthology survey of Chapter 5 constitutes an attempt at a preservative view, in Gerson's terms, of one sector of the Canadian literary field versus a selective view, like the one Norris, Trehearne and their predecessors utilize by defining modernism narrowly. The survey, a strategy I borrowed from Gerson, shows that the field of poetry in Canada was dominated by Victorian and nationalist writers in the first half of the twentieth century. Other literary critics have found similar results. In her book on *Contemporary Verse*, Joan McCullagh states that modernism was not "the dominant mood" of Canadian poetry during the 1930s (xxi). She contests Gnarowski's claim to that effect by citing the CAA's *Poetry Year Books* and a long list of nonmodernist poets who were active and publishing in the thirties. If the literary trajectories of Livesay and Macbeth typify the field, by the end of the 1920-1950 period, modernist literary forms and themes overcame Victorian literature in the Canadian literary field; however, Canadian writers continued to struggle with and debate the relationship between nationalism and culture. Robert Lecker believes that the cultural nationalists of the 1920s and 1930s won the literary standards debate. In his view, a nationalist standard, one that valorizes a literature of social and cultural realism, dominates the English-Canadian canon today ("The Canonization of Canadian Literature" 666, 670). Although the literary field of 1920 to 1950 was largely Victorian and nationalist, the powers that be, especially in the field of post-secondary education, were not necessarily nationalist. The predominance of nonnationalists in Canadian universities speaks to Canada's colonial position among white, English language, industrialized nations. The emphasis of contemporary Canadian literary academics on modernism is perhaps the remnant of that legacy. Certainly, the emphasis on modernist writing has distorted Canadian literary history by relegating nonmodernist literary forms to the background and by ignoring the effects of nationalism on the literary field. Choices made by analysts are based on subjective evaluations, the social construction of each critic, and the politics of maintaining a place for literary studies in educational institutions.

The importance of cultural studies and the usefulness of Bourdieu's concept of the field to an understanding of literature become clear in the outcome of such contextual analysis. Attention to the articulation of institutions, politics, power relations, and the economy with the literary field and with writers' position-takings can illuminate events in the literary field, historicize the canon, and put into perspective the oppositions that are often attributed to the popular-literature/literary-writing binary. Had I analyzed the work of several women writers, the popular-literature/literary-writing binary may have more quickly revealed its limits. For instance, a discussion of five different Canadian women writers may have broken down the dichotomous nature of the split between popular and literary. As it was, the process of writing this dissertation was one of continual adjustment of my thinking on the positioning of Livesay and Macbeth in relation to one another and to the issues under discussion. For example, Macbeth's development from cultural nationalism in the 1920s to a nationalism tempered by an appreciation of international literary standards in the 1940s, and Livesay's development from continentalism in the 1930s to cultural nationalism in the 1970s both complicate the nationalist-internationalist dichotomy with which I analyzed their work at the start of this project. Furthermore, the ways in which the work of radical literary writers can be useful to the capitalist and continentalist hegemony of Canada and the U.S.A. complicates the left/right binary. Binaries are marked by exceptions and the exceptions can serve hegemonic forces by suggesting the illusion of freedom from ideological pressures, in the same way that a constructed canon poses as `truth' in the literary arena. However, from the perspective of analyzing major issues in a cultural field, the strategy of following the professional and intellectual trajectories of these two women writers has been sound because they each operated in different movements and generations. My application of Bourdieu's concept of the artistic generation to the literary field serves to organize the complexities of the modernist poetry movement in Canada. I use the literary generation as a historical materialist method of mapping out the field; as Bourdieu has commented, "the history of the field is made in the very struggle" between artistic generations (*The Rules of Art* 157). The concept of the literary generation clarifies temporal changes in a field. My brief outline of three generations of modernist poets provides the background for a focus on the middle, Livesay generation. The discussion of struggles for power between modernist literary generations reveals some of the ways that power circulated in the Canadian literary field. The same kind of analysis remains to be done for the literary generations in the arena of popular literature.

Several subjects touched upon in this project deserve further research. A comparative survey of Livesay's and Macbeth's works is incomplete without a discussion of their relationships within the field of radio. Macbeth was quick to explore the new technology of radio. In the early years of Canadian radio production, she wrote and produced *Superwoman*, a humorous parody of the New Woman, for one of the first Canadian radio stations, CNRO (Canadian National Railway Ottawa). In 1937, she broadcast reports about her travels to South and Central America on CRCO, the CBC's radio station in Ottawa.[125] "Off the Highway," Macbeth's mystery series for radio was produced by the Vancouver branch of the CBC in 1943. Livesay's radio work begins in the late thirties and continues through the fifties. In the forties and fifties, she wrote radio dramas dealing with racism and the problems faced by Native Peoples, documentaries on canonical writers, and personal opinion talks on political issues.[126] The ways in which Livesay and Macbeth intersected with the medium of radio resembles their relative positionings in the literary field discussed in this dissertation. Most of Livesay's works were broadcast on the Trans-Canada Network, the first version of FM or Radio 2, which is oriented to high art for an educated audience. Macbeth's mystery series appeared on the Western Network, on a program of popular works aimed at a less-educated audience. Andrew Allan, the CBC Radio Drama Producer who developed a world-renowned studio of innovative radio drama writers during the 1950s, was more interested in Livesay's work than in Macbeth's. After producing Macbeth's mystery series in the west in 1943, Allan was promoted to national drama supervisor in Toronto where he rejected a subsequent submission by Macbeth, "He Wouldn't Say Yes...," describing it as "inexpert" and "over-sentimentaliz[ed]" (CACRCO MG59 Box 1 CBC Radio File Item 671). How do Livesay's and Macbeth's radio dramas relate to the archive of their other works? What problems, if any, did each face as they learned to write in a genre that demands attention to the sound of the spoken word? How did the technical aspects of radio affect their writing? How did their positions in the field of radio articulate with their positions in the literary field? These questions remain to be addressed.

Another research area deserving of further examination relates to the preservative approach to literary history; this approach favours the inclusion of alleged minor writers in the literary canon and the recovery of lost works. My work on Macbeth has been in the feminist tradition of recovering the work of women who write for large audiences in popular genres such as journalism, fiction, and satire. The recovery of the writing of Canadian women leaders on the political left would be an appropriate project for a materialist-feminist historian. As part of Canadian literary history, Livesay's Marxist work also deserves to be represented in the canon. However, the systemic antipolitical, antipopular, and antifeminine biases of the literary field make it difficult for critics and audiences to appreciate the work of women who write for the masses, whether in popular literature genres or political tracts and manifestoes. Nevertheless, audiences in the field of large scale literary production are pursued by both the politically radical writer and the writer of the mystery, the horror story, the thriller, and the romance. The powerful position held by this large group of readers provides an entry point into a study of the articulation of radical and popular writers with the political and literary fields in which they operate. Such a study would provide an alternative and more complete view of Canadian literary history.

The literary field in which Livesay developed from an imagist poet into a socially engaged writer has not been described in detail in this project, and has been largely ignored by Canadian literary critics. As Lecker comments in "Watson and Pierce's *Our Canadian Literature* Anthology and the Representation of Nation," nationalist publishers and editors deliberately excluded political writing in order to represent Canada as a homogeneous and stable nation. "What was 'representative' in 1921," he writes, "was verse that reinforced the idea that certain forms of poetry - those *not* concerned with social and political issues of the day - were more worthy than others" (73). This attitude, which articulates with the devaluation of popular writing, has persisted to this day and affects the choices made by literary critics and researchers. For instance, the journals of unions and political parties, such as the *Peoples' Advocate* and the *Pacific Tribune* of Vancouver, are excluded from discussions of the rise of the little magazine in Canada. Norris defines the little magazine as modernist and experimental. Are small political journals popularized versions of the little experimental magazines which Norris examines? Do they publish modernist writing? How do little political magazines articulate with established political and cultural magazines such as the *Canadian Forum*? Socially committed writers such as Livesay and Kennedy published in both fields. How do leftist magazines in the west relate to those in east and the north? This line of analysis necessitates further consideration of the articulation of the political field with the literary field. There is a need in Canada for a volume of excerpts from leftist little magazines such as *Masses* (1932-1934) and *New Frontier* (1936-1937). Such a compilation of American writing on the left has been produced in the USA.[127] In Canada, Livesay, Arnason, and Todd took a step in this direction when they produced *Right Hand Left Hand: A True Life of the Thirties* (1977).

A Materialist-Feminist Analysis of Dorothy Livesay, Madge Macbeth, and the Canadian Literary Field of 1920-1950 provides a sketch of the period and a starting point from which to address the questions it raises. I see this project as a beginning rather than an ending.

Notes

1. Disposition is the Bourdieuian equivalent to positionality which some feminists use to discuss one's positioning or interpellated position based on race, gender, sexuality, and ethnicity. I use position in this dissertation in two senses: as a stand on an issue and as a place in a field. In Bourdieu's theoretical model, which I examine in detail in Chapter 1, social, economic, and political factors determine what positions are available in a field. People are disposed or interpellated, by their classed, racialized, and gendered experiences in families and in social institutions, to take up certain positions in a field. However, position-taking, also a term I borrow from Bourdieu, emphasizes the agency of the interpellated person, who may reject or modify certain aspects of his or her construction and choose a position to which he or she was not disposed. I see positionality and disposition as analytical tools which suggest fixity or permanence, whereas position-taking allows for the possibility of social change.

2. The poetry journals are *Contemporary Verse* (1941-1953) and Contemporary Verse 2 (1975-). The political journal is *New Frontier* (1936-1937). The anthologies are *40 Women Poets of Canada* (Ingluvin, 1971) and *Woman's Eye: 12 B.C. Poets* (Air, 1978). See also *Collected Poems of Raymond Knister* (Ryerson 1949).

3. Low modernism is a term I adopt from Maria DiBattista's introduction to *High and Low Moderns* (1996), with the understanding that it must be qualified by an examination of the factors underlying the high/low binary and its intersection with the popular-literature/literary-writing continuum. I use low modernism to refer to socially engaged versions of modernist poetry which focus on work, the working class, and social inequities. I examine the complications inherent in the high-low binary more fully in Chapter 4.

4. Thanks to Carole Gerson for a copy of a faxed letter, dated January 18, 1995, from Macbeth's granddaughter, Mike Macbeth. In her letter, Mike Macbeth states: "Nana lied constantly about her age. However, she was 84 when she died." My research of the "Registration of Births in 1878 in the City of Philadelphia" shows Macbeth's birthdate to be November 6, 1878. She died at age eighty-six.

5. I draw on Bourdieu's concept of the field of power, which he defines as the social arena in which politics and economics control social processes. I see science, technology, education, and religion as equally important factors in the field of power. As I explain in Chapter 2, Bourdieu locates the field of literary production in a dominated position within the field of power. See pages 37-39 of *The Field of Cultural Production* (1993).

6. I use articulate here to indicate the multiple planes of intersection between internationalism and modernism, an articulation addressed in Chapter 4. In Chapter 2, I turn to Stuart Hall's definition of articulation as unity in difference to discuss feminist

7. Also called Canadian Authors' Week by B.K. Sandwell in his editorial of January 1922 for *The Canadian Bookman* 4.2: 37.

8. See especially "The Canon Between the Wars: Field-notes of a Feminist Literary Archaeologist," in *Canadian Canons: Essays in Literary Value* (1991), edited by Robert Lecker; "Anthologies and the Canon of Early Canadian Women Writers," in *Re(Dis)covering Our Foremothers: Nineteenth-Century Canadian Women Writers* (1989), edited by Lorraine McMullen; "The Business of a Woman's Life: Money and Motive in the Careers of Early Canadian Women Writers," in *Women's Writing and the Literary Institution* (1992), edited by Claudine Potvin and Janice Williamson.

9. For further references to archival material, I use these abbreviations:

NAC: Madge Macbeth Papers, National Archives of Canada
CACRCO: Madge Macbeth Papers, City Archives and Corporate Resource Centre of Ottawa
UA: Dorothy Livesay Papers, University of Alberta, Bruce Peel Special Collections Library
UM: Dorothy Livesay Collection, Department of Archives and Special Collections, University of Manitoba Libraries.

See *The Papers of Dorothy Livesay, A Research Tool* (1986) for a description of archival holdings at the Universities of Alberta and Manitoba. See also the finding aids of the Madge Macbeth papers at the National Archives and the City Archives and Corporate Resource Centre of Ottawa.

10. See the Woman's Supplement of the *Canadian Courier* 28 Dec. 1912: 15.

11. Thanks to Carole Gerson for a copy of a family genealogy sent to her by Mrs. Charles Macbeth. Incorrect information in this family genealogy (Madge's birthdate listed as 1880, and her marriage date [1901] as 1902) and inconsistencies in her father's name (H.H.Lyons) lead me to believe that more research and analysis of Macbeth's Jewish ancestry remains to be done.

12. Between 1947 and 1949, Livesay received $100 each for several articles published in the *Star Weekly*. See Correspondence between Livesay and various *Star Weekly* editors in the Livesay papers at the University of Alberta, 96-69, Queen's Box 2, File 21. I analyze these articles in Chapter 3.

13. See Chapter 2 for a discussion of the distinctions made in feminist theory between patriarchy and masculinism.

14. For Harding, see her essay "Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What is "Strong Objectivity?"" in *The Centennial Review* 36.3 (Fall 1992), pages 437-470; for Smith, see

"Women's Experience as a Radical Critique of Sociology" in *The Conceptual Practices of Power: A Feminist Sociology of Knowledge* (1990).

15. See "Feminist Standpoint, Discourse, and Authority: From Women's Lives to Ideology Critique" in Hennessy's *Materialist Feminism and the Politics of Discourse* (1993), p. 67-99.

16. Catherine Hundleby, "Material Dimensions of Oppositional Consciousness in Feminist Standpoint Theory." Paper presented to *(The) Concrete Matters: Feminist Materialism across the Disciplines*, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, March 6, 1998.

17. See my case study: "When Women Try to Work with Television Technology." *Canadian Journal of Communication* 14.3 (Fall 1989): 63-75.

18. See letters from Elsinore Haultain, Advertising Manager of Ryerson Press to Livesay. Florence picked up clippings of reviews of Livesay's books from Haultain and sent them to her daughter in Vancouver. (UA 96-69 Box 1 Correspondence with Ryerson File 1)

19. For Anglo-American definitions of feminisms, see Maggie Humm's *The Dictionary of Feminist Theory* (1990).

20. This term was coined by British writer George Gissing and first appears in his novel *Odd Women* (1893). See Campbell and McMullen page 14.

21. For an analysis of Duncan's contradictory relationship with feminism, see Misao Dean's *A Different Point of View*, Chapter 4, especially pages 74-75.

22. Tony left Livesay for her best friend Gina Watts.

23. Ecofeminism is an example of a contemporary transfer of this kind. See Janet Biehl's *Finding Our Way: Rethinking Ecofeminist Politics* (1991).

24. See the clippings in the Macbeth Papers, NAC MG30 D52 Vol.14 Scrapbooks 1936-1945 and 1940-1944.

25. This quotation appears in "Mrs. M. Macbeth Blames Strikes on Labor Leaders," an article from *The Monitor*, n.d. See other articles in the same location, especially "Speaker Urges Every Possible Sacrifice, Every Aid For Britain," and "Altered Duties of Women In Wartime Are Discussed By Mrs. Macbeth for Club."

26. From Cecily Devereux's paper, "Canadian Women's Travel Writing," given at the Orlando Conference, University of Alberta, September 14, 1997.

27. Macbeth's interest in her paternal grandmother's Spanish ancestry and lack of interest in her paternal grandfather's Jewish ancestry exemplifies Werner Sollor's differentiation between consent and descent, a differentiation I discuss later in this introduction.

28. See "Strange Encounter: Raymond Knister," in *Journey with My Selves* and "Raymond Knister A Memoir," in *Right Hand Left Hand*.

29. Livesay's early imagist poetry, collected in *Green Pitcher* (1928) and *Signpost* (1932), is modernist, but in the period under discussion here, she began to write about factories and the class struggle. Critics classify imagist poetry as high modernist or pre-modernist, and political poetry as low modernist. See Chapter 3 for a discussion of the differences between low and high modernism.

30. David Arnason, personal conversation July 16, 1997.

31. See Kristeva's *Nations Without Nationalism* (1993), Trudeau's *Against the Current: Selected Writings 1939-1996*, Anderson's *Imagined Commmunities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (1991), Ignatieff's *Blood and Belonging: Journeys Into The New Nationalism* (1993); see also Fiona Wilson and Bodil Folke Frederiksen, *Ethnicity, Gender and the Subversion of Nationalism* (1995), p.3; Robert Sibley, "The German who shaped Canada: Georg Wilhelm Freidrich Hegel and conservative Canadian nationalism" in *The Ottawa Citizen* 5 June 1998: A15. For an example of a nineteenth-century Canadian nationalist's conservative politics, see Carl Berger, "The true north strong and free" in *Nationalism in Canada* (1966), p.17. E.J. Hobsbawm gives both points of view (nationalism as conservatism and nationalism's intersection with socialism). See his *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780* (1990), pages 102-106 and 125-130.

32. Chretien's introductory speech to Canada Day celebrations on Parliament Hill, July 1, 1998, broadcast nationally by Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) Television.

33. Reported by Mark Kelley on *The National*, CBC Television, November 12, 1997.

34. See "Business Cycles," by Donald G. Paterson in *The Canadian Encyclopedia* (1985), Volume 1, pages 244-245.

35. See Thompson and Seager (1994), page 181.

36. See the Seventh Census of Canada (1931) Volume 5, Table 57, page 979.

37. Lapin is a cultural analyst for *Wired* magazine of San Francisco, U.S.A. He was interviewed on CBC Radio's news-magazine program, "As It Happens," on May 12, 1995.

38. Thompson and Seager, Table XIIIa, page 350, and Table XIV, page 351.

39. See "An Answer to Lionel Stevenson's Manifesto" by George [sic] Bugnet, *The Canadian Bookman* 6.4 (April 1924): 85-86, and "Attributes of a National Literature" by Alicia Carveth Campbell in *The Canadian Bookman* 6.3 (March 1924): 61-63. Campbell's name does not appear with her article in the March issue but the error is corrected in an Editorial note on page 86 of the April 1924 issue. This editorial note also indicates the nationalist goal of the magazine: "We feel that our readers will share with us the conviction in regard to all three of these articles, that they constitute a real advance in the development of a national spirit" (86). B.K. Sandwell was the editor of *The Canadian Bookman* in this period. See Chapter 2 for further discussion of this journal's position in the Canadian literary field.

40. See "A Call For a Leader" by L.M. Dickson in *The Canadian Bookman* 15.8 (August 1933): 99-100; "Spirited Reply to 'A Call for a Leader'" by P.D. Ross in *The Canadian Bookman* 15.9 (September 1933): 115-116; "That Missing Leader" by C.F. Lloyd in *The Canadian Bookman* 15.10 (October 1933): 131-132; "A Challenge Accepted" by Mabella Roen Garatt in *The Canadian Bookman* 15.11 (November 1933): 148; "Again The Challenge!" by L.M. Dickson in *The Canadian Bookman* 15.12 (December 1933): 171. For other articles on Canadian literature in *The Canadian Bookman*, see Heggie and McGaughey.

41. On sociobiology and race, see Goldberg, p.6, 145-146, and Chapter 4; on sociobiology and gender, see Edward O. Wilson (99-104), Lionel Tiger and Robin Fox (222-225), and Anthony Storr (386-387) in *Feminist Frameworks: Alternative Theoretical Accounts of the Relations Between Women and Men*, Second Edition. Eds. Alison M. Jaggar and Paula S. Rothenberg (1984).

42. This job did not materialize.

43. In the Dorothy Livesay Papers in the Bruce Peel Special Collections Library at the University of Alberta, there is a letter dated November 29, 1932 from J.F.B. Livesay to Harry Jones of *The Star*, Halifax. This letter concerns a review of Dorothy Livesay's *Signpost* (1932). See Collection 96-69, Queen's Box 1, Business Correspondence 1932-1959.

44. For other concerns about the cross-cultural use of Bourdieu's model, see Edward LiPuma, page 26, and Craig Calhoun, page 66.

45. Eayrs was President of Macmillan Canada from 1921 to 1940. See David Young.

46. See Calhoun p.71; Lash p.206; Fowler p.37; Shiach p.215, 218.

47. Jenkins passim; see also Wacquant p.238 for references to Hoffman, Joppke, Aronowitz and Giroux.

48. The phrase "pure art" is adopted from T. Richardson's title, "In Defense of Pure Art," an essay that was published in the July-August 1932 issue of *Masses*. I use literary writing, high art, pure art, and art for art's sake interchangeably in the popular literature-pure art binary. I discuss Richardson's essay and E. Cecil Smith's reply later in this chapter.

49. Information on average income of writers obtained by personal communication with Statistics Canada Library, June 30, 1998; Livesay's financial records in UM Mss 37 Box 31, Folder 1.

50. Sandra Djwa maintains that in Canada "the modern was also the buoyantly romantic" because Canadian modernist poets' attitude to the landscape, which comprised the subject of much of their writing, was markedly different from "[t]he cultivated disillusionment that characterizes such poems" as *The Waste Land* (16).

51. Smith made this claim on March 7, 1998, in her plenary address, "The Social Relations of Objectified Discourse," at *[The] Concrete Matters: Feminist Materialisms Across the Disciplines* conference held at the University of Alberta in Edmonton, March 5-7, 1998.

52. Delphy began her critique of French sociological methodology in 1970; her work began to be published in English in 1976, and was collected in 1984 in *Close to Home*.

53. This critique was taken up by Marilyn Waring in *If Women Counted: A New Feminist Economics* (1988).

54. See *Feminist Review* 1.1 (1979); Ebert replaces proletarian and bourgeois with workers and owners, the delineation on which Marxism is based. Paraphrase of her answer to a question at *(The) Concrete Matters* conference, University of Alberta, Edmonton, March 5, 1998.

55. According to Joseph Interrante and Carol Lasser, Barbara Ehrenreich and Deidre English introduced the term masculinism into feminist discourse in 1978 with the publication of their book *For Her Own Good: 150 Years of the Experts' Advice to Women* (Doubleday). See page 33 of "Victims of the Very Songs they Sing: A Critique of Recent Work on Patriarchal Culture and the Social Construction of Gender," by Interrante and Lasser in *Radical History Review* 20 (Spring/Summer 1979): 25-40.

56. In a lecture given at the University of Alberta on April 21, 1997, Ebert defined her neologism, "post-ality," as a way to refer to the theories of post-Fordism, poststructuralism, etc. She challenges the orthodoxy of post-ality.

57. Personal interview, February 1998.

58. Michael Ignatieff, *Blood and Belonging: Journeys Into the New Nationalism* (1993); Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (1983); Tom Nairn, *Faces of Nationalism: Janus*

Revisited (1997); E.J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780* (1990); Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (1991); Peter Russell, Ed. *Nationalism in Canada* (1966); W.L. Morton, *The Canadian Identity* (1972); George Grant, *Lament for a Nation: The Defeat of Canadian Nationalism* (1965, 1991); P.E. Trudeau, *Against the Current: Selected Writings 1939-1996* (1996); Julien Benda, *The Betrayal of the Intellectuals* (1928, 1955); Douglas Cole, "The Problem of "Nationalism" and "Imperialism" in British Settlement Colonies" in *Journal of British Studies* 10.2 (May 1971): 160-182; Don Luigi Sturzo, *Nationalism and Internationalism* (1946).

Anne McClintock says that Frantz Fanon is "exemplary" among male theorists of the nation for his attention to gender. See McClintock's *Imperial Leather* (1995) p.360, and Fanon's *Black Skin, White Masks* (1986) p.141.

For reference to male Canadian historians who also ignore gender, see Susan Mann Trofimenkoff's "Nationalism, Feminism & Canadian Intellectual History" in *Canadian Literature* 83 (Winter 1979): 7-20.

59. For example, see Ignatieff's *Blood and Belonging: Journeys Into the New Nationalism* (1993) passim; also Fiona Wilson and Bodil Folke Frederiksen, Eds. *Ethnicity, Gender, and the Subversion of Nationalism* (1995), p.3; and Robert Sibley, "The German who shaped Canada: Georg Wilhelm Freidrich Hegel and conservative Canadian nationalism" in *The Ottawa Citizen* 5 June 1998: A15.

60. See Jean Bethke Elshtain, "Sovereignty, Identity, Sacrifice" in *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 20.3 (December 1991): 395-406, p. 402, 404; E.J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780* (1990), p.9; Deniz Kandiyoti, "Identity and its Discontents: Women and the Nation" in *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 20.3 (December 1991): 429-443, p. 431, 441; Tom Nairn, *Faces of Nationalism: Janus Revisited* (1997) passim, and "Demonising Nationalism" in *London Review of Books* (25 Feb. 1993): 4-6; P.E. Trudeau, *Against the Current: Selected Writings 1939-1996* (1996) p.153.

61. The pro-intellectual elitism of civic nationalists like Ignatieff relates to a similar tendency found in high modernism. The two fields articulate through their mutual masculinism. I address the masculinity of modernism in Chapter 4.

62. See Michel Brunet's "The French Canadians' search for a fatherland" in *Nationalism in Canada*, edited by Peter Russell. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1966, pages 47-60.

63. Angela Davis has criticized Brownmiller for perpetuating the myth of the black rapist, an ideological construction of white American supremacists to justify the widespread lynching of African Americans after the abolition of slavery in the U.S. However, Brownmiller's thesis, that patriarchy treats women as property across racial and class lines, and Davis's contention that African American Anti-Lynching Crusaders saw "male dominance" as a link among races of American women are similar arguments which I find useful for this analysis of the WWII period in Canada. See Davis's Women, Race and Class, especially pages 178-201.

64. Dismantling of daycare systems was a widespread practice among the allied nations of WWII. It occurred in Canada. For a similar situation in Ireland, see page 45 of "Women on the Margin: The Women's Movements in Northern Ireland, 1973-1995" in *Feminist Nationalism*, edited by Lois West. (New York: Routledge, 1997).

65. See Canada, Seventh Census, Volume 5, Tables 28 and 41 (1931); Eighth Census, Volume 6, Tables 6, 16 (1941); and Ninth Census, Vol.5, Table 21 (1951).

66. In 1947, Gowan received $50.00 for third prize for the radio drama *Breeches from Bond Street*. The prize was given by the Western Canadian Theatre Conference, which was set up by the Rockefeller Foundation in 1944. See Gowan's papers (1933-1954) in the University of Alberta's Book and Record Depository; see also Tippett, p. 163, 167.

67. Other factors, such as the heavy amount of American advertising in Canada for American cultural products, also contributed to reduced publishing of Canadian literature by Macmillan Canada. See David Young, pages 125-129.

68. Some other Canadian writers who lived and worked elsewhere, but not necessarily for the same reasons as Heming: Constance Lindsay Skinner, Sara Jeannette Duncan, Charles G.D. and Theodore G. Roberts, Frank Packard, Robert Service, Basil King, Arthur Stringer, Bliss Carman.

69. I discuss the misogyny of Scott's poem more fully in Chapters One and Four.

70. Some of the other female members of the Council were F.R. Livesay (who often submitted her daughter's poetry to the CAA's literary organs), Jessie G. Sime, Emily Murphy, and Marjorie Pickthall.

71. French was also the President of the Toronto branch of the CAA in 1932, the co-author of *Highways of Canadian Literature* (1924), and a contributor to *The Canadian Bookman*.

72. Emily Murphy was a Judge; R.J.C. Stead, L.J. Burpee and D.C.Scott were civil servants; W.T. Allison, Sir C.G.D. Roberts, Pelham Edgar, Frank Stiling, W.G.Hardy, R.S.Longley, and Watson Kirkconnell were academics. Although Roberts was mainly a poet, he also worked as "special lecturer" at the University of British Columbia during 1926 (Harrington 102). W.T. Allison and C.W. Gordon were Ministers; W.D. Lighthall was for three years the Mayor of Westmount, Quebec, an Anglophone upper-class residential area in Montreal.

73. The *Canadian Bookman* published for one year each in 1909 and 1915 before it established itself for 22 years between 1919 and 1939. It was the official organ of the CAA between 1921 and 1923, and the CAA purchased a supplement in the *Bookman* from 1923 to 1931. The CAA published other magazines, such as *The Canadian Author* (1933-1940)

and *Canadian Poetry Magazine* (1936-68). In 1940 the *Canadian Author* and the *Canadian Bookman* amalgamated into the *Canadian Author and Bookman*. See "Preface" in Heggie and McGaughey, and "Thumbnail History of the *Canadian Author and Bookman.*"

74. For a list of these critics, see Mulvihill.

75. An undated loose clipping in Macbeth's Papers, titled "Speaks on Yugoslavia," reports that the Women's Guild of St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church produced 196 hand-made items "for Christmas boxes to be sent overseas"; among these items were "well over 100 pairs of socks." See NAC MG30 D52 Vol.14 Scrapbook 1940-1944.

76. The term fifth columnist arose from the siege of Madrid by Franco's forces during the Spanish Civil War. Franco had four columns advancing on the city; the fifth column consisted of the collaborators within Madrid. See Macbeth's interview in "Sentimentalists May Be Canada's Fifth Column Says Canadian Author In Interview Wednesday." NAC MG30 D52 Vol.14 Scrapbook 1940-1944.

77. See also Harrington, 209-216.

78. Notably, one association affiliated with the National Council of Women was the Lady Aberdeen Association for Distribution of Literature to Settlers in the West. Lady Aberdeen assisted in the founding of this imperialist organization in 1890. See Prentice p.201.

79. The relationship between household helpers and their employers is represented in Macbeth's novel *Shackles*, which was published much earlier, in 1926. See p. 180 for a scene in which the maid takes the heroine-employer for granted.

80. Cultural producers of both sexes were also ignored by the Reconstruction Committee. In 1944, the Heliconian Club successfully pressured Ian Mackenzie, Minister responsible for reconstruction, to include "actors, musicians, writers, and artists" in educational and loan programs for veterans. See Tippett p.170-171.

81. Brandt notes that Ruth Roach Pierson analyzes the class bias and self-serving work of the Subcommittee with regard to domestics. See Pierson's article, "Home Aide: A Solution to Women's Unemployment After World War II" in *Atlantis* 2.2 (Spring 1977): 89.

82. On the professionalization of housework, see Prentice et al, p.280-285 and Penny Sparke, Chapter 4.

83. See C.C. Hamilton and Maude Petitt Hill.

84. According to Fraser Sutherland, the strikers were locked out over a dispute concerning the introduction of mechanical typesetting equipment (87).

85. Skinner published only one volume of poetry but "nearly 200 book reviews and critical articles" as well as 13 novels, 1 play, and 6 histories, mostly in the 1920s and 1930s (Relke 10).

86. See NAC MG30 D52 Vol.2 Correspondence 1924 Item 994.

87. See Brown's contribution on poetry to the *University of Toronto Quarterly*'s "Letters in Canada: 1936," p.341 and my use of Brown's assessment of *New Provinces* in Chapter 4 (p. 247 here).

88. Bradbury and McFarlane are quoting from *Beyond All This Fiddle: Essays, 1955-1967* by A. Alvarez (London 1968).

89. In the discourse of 1920-1950, internationalism refers to relations between industrialized nations, that is, to the 'first world'. The term global is a relatively new term from the discipline of political science; it allows for an inclusive discussion of states in all stages of economic and industrial development. Global was not used in the period under discussion.

90. Griffin 1910-1930 (4); Bradbury and McFarlane 1890-1930; Sparke 1890-1940 (90); Elliott and Wallace 1890-1939, 1850-1975 (3); Connolly in Bradbury and McFarlane 1880-1950 (31); DiBattista 1889-1939 (10).

91. The end of the modernist period is under just as much contention as its beginnings. Some literary critics characterize contemporary literature as modernist. See Gerald Graff, "The myth of the postmodernist breakthrough" in *TriQuarterly* 26 (Winter 1973): 383-417 and Ihab Hassan's "POSTmodernISM: A Paracritical Bibliography" in his *Paracriticisms: Seven Speculations of the Times* (1975).

92. See *Acanthus and Wild Grapes* by Call (1920), and *Open Water* by Stringer (1914). See also Arnason's "Canadian Poetry: the Interregnum." Kaufmann claims that Pound's Imagism is heavily indebted to the poetics of H.D. (p. 61).

93. During 1934-35 she belonged to the Communist Party of the United States. See *Right Hand Left Hand*, page 131.

94. Although Livesay retained an interest in and sympathetic attitude toward racial issues throughout her life, the CPC was ruled by headquarters in the U.S.S.R. When the interests of African Americans conflicted with those of headquarters, American communists followed the lead of the U.S.S.R. In Canada, we see such waffling in the case of the united front, which was suddenly a CPC priority when it became one in the U.S.S.R. Previous to headquarters orders, Canadian communists competed with other Canadian leftists to organize unions.

95. "Day and Night" was published seven times between 1936 and 1986. There are two versions of the poem in Livesay's papers at the University of Alberta's Bruce Peel Special Collections Library: one which has the section containing labor and a shorter version without this section (See 96-69 Box "Poems: Typescripts and Originals 1931-1947" Folder 1934 and 1935). The version containing labor/labour is the definitive version; it appears in five of the seven publications.

96. For Livesay, see Chapter 4; for Pickthall, and mention in passing of Brown, see Sandra Campbell, "`A Girl in a Book': Writing Marjorie Pickthall and Lorne Pierce," *Canadian Poetry* 39 (Fall/Winter 1996): 80-95; for Brown and Ferne, see Gerson, "The Canon Between the Wars: Field-Notes of a Feminist Literary Archaeologist" in *Canadian Canons: Essays in Literary Value*, Ed. Robert Lecker, University of Toronto Press, 1991: 46-56.

97. The *Canadian Bookman* began to call itself *The Canadian Bookman* when it went to a monthly from a quarterly in 1922. In 1940, the name changed again to *Canadian Author and Bookman*. This editorial by Sandwell appeared in 1919.

98. See Volume 58, Number 1, April 1941 of *Poetry, A Magazine of Verse*. See also W.E. Collin's essay "Poetry," on the Canadian modernists Kennedy, Smith, Klein, Livesay, Pratt and Brown, in *Canadian Literature Today: A Series of Broadcasts Sponsored by the CBC* (1938).

99. In her 1939 broadcast during Canada Book Week, Macbeth praised Ralph Connor with these words: "I can't pass on without paying a personal tribute to that kindly Presbyterian Sky Pilot, whose posthumous autobiography..`Postscript to Adventure'..is one of the most significant human documents in our literature." Beneath the typed word "significant," Macbeth has written "eloquent." (CACRCO MG59 Vol 2 File 23 Page 6).

100. See, for example, his treatment of Amy Lowell (35,39) and his appreciation of Louis Mackay's chauvinist poem "I Often Wonder" (85). See p.13 for his view of the feminine as negative, and p. 15-16 for a homophobic depiction of male decadent poets. The use of "seminal" to describe important writing is phallocentric (115).

101. Pratt's use of gelatine and muscular illustrates the masculinist nature of his modernism. If Livesay's poem had been `feminine,' it would not have been considered `fine' (or modernist) by Pratt.

102. Besides Gerson's "Anthologies and the Canon of Early Canadian Women Writers" and "The Canon between the Wars: Field-notes of a Feminist Literary Archaeologist," see Rosemary Sullivan's *Stories by Canadian Women* (1984) and *Poetry by Canadian Women* (1989); Gerson's and Gwen Davies' *Canadian Poetry From the Beginning through the First World War* (1994); Sandra Campbell's and Lorraine McMullen's *New Women: Short Stories by Canadian Women 1900-1920* (1991), and Carrie MacMillan's, McMullen's, and Elizabeth Waterston's *Silenced Sextet: Six Nineteenth-Century Canadian Women Novelists*

(1992).

103. See Pacey on A.J.M. Smith and F.R. Scott in *Ten Canadian Poets* (1958) and Beattie in the *Literary History of Canada* (1965) ("Poetry 1935-1950").

104. In her April 25, 1928 letter to Knister, Livesay speculates that if the editors of *The Canadian Mercury* were to include French Canadian literature in their publication, "such a magazine could not help but bring the two nationalities closer together." Livesay's thinking in this period subscribes to the Romantic nationalist notion that a national literature has the power to unify a heterogenous nation. Apparently, the germ of the cultural nationalism of Livesay's later life, for example, during the 1960s and 1970s, lies in her imagist period in the 1920s. (The William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University Library, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada.)

105. See the F.R. Scott Papers, National Archives of Canada MG30 D211 Volume 1, microfilm reel H1211, Letters of February 15 and March 7, 1934.

106. See the letters of February 17 and March 26, 1934 in the F.R. Scott papers at the NAC.

107. Pratt taught English literature at Victoria College of the University of Toronto, Finch taught French literature at University College of the University of Toronto, Scott taught law at McGill University, and Smith taught English literature at Michigan State College.

108. Livesay studied with Cassidy in Toronto in 1933 and clashed with him over Marxism; Whitton represents the political right in this trio, with Cassidy at the left of centre and Livesay at the far left.

109. The dates of Livesay's membership in the CPC are not firmly established. Dean Irvine, based on Livesay's statement in *Journey with My Selves* (81), uses 1933 as the start of her official membership in the Party (see *Archive for Our Times* 252). The entry on Livesay in *The Feminist Companion for Literature in English* uses 1932. I have yet to find a membership card or letter from the CPC to Livesay in her papers.

110. See the April 1934 issue, page 251.

111. For example, see "A Priest in the Family," in the April 1933 issue of *The Canadian Forum*.

112. See *Right Hand Left Hand* (1977), p. 225.

113. This fee had tripled by 1946. The *Canadian Author and Bookman*'s money-making and marketing tips for writers notes that "unrhymed free verse is worth twenty cents a line" to a Los Angeles publication, whereas "humorous poems" and "poems with a love

theme are worth twenty-five cents a line." See the March 1946 issue, page 42.

114. Although Donald French contributed to this text, most of it was written by J.D. Logan, a Professor of Canadian Literature at Acadia University. French wrote three chapters on novels, short stories, and fiction. See p. 6-7 of the preface.

115. See Appendix A for a list of the anthologies.

116. According to Livesay's papers in the Bruce Peel Special Collections library at the University of Alberta, "The Child Looks Out" was written in 1938. Livesay's 1986 volume *Selected Poems: The Self-Completing Tree* dates this poem at 1941.

117. The seven anthologies are Ethel Hume Bennett's *New Harvesting* (1938), Earle Birney's *Twentieth-Century Canadian Poetry* (1953), J.D. Robins' *A Pocketful of Canada* (1946), Bertram Brooker's *The Yearbook of the Arts in Canada 1936*, Margaret Fairley's *Spirit of Democracy* (1945), the CAA's *Poetry Year Book 1929-30* (Montreal branch), and the CAA's *Voices of Victory* (1941). The four in which "Winter" and "A Child Looks Out" appear are *A Pocketful of Canada, Twentieth-Century Canadian Poetry, New Harvesting*, and *Voices of Victory*.

118. *Sheaf of Verse* (Ryerson, 1929), the only volume I have examined by the Writers' Craft Club, offers the poetry of sixteen women and two men. One of the women is Hilda Ridley, who "assisted" Alan Creighton in the editing of the academic-professional text, *A New Canadian Anthology* (1938). The membership of the Writers' Craft Club, located in Toronto, may resemble that of the CAA; therefore, I have classed it with Association Anthologies.

119. The judges were A.M. Stephen, Watson Kirkconnell, E.J. Pratt, E.A. Hardy, S. Morgan-Powell, and V.B. Rhodenizer. The editorial board consisted of Nathaniel Benson, W.A. Deacon, John M. Elson, and Amabel King.

120. Surveyed anthologies which self-identify as textbooks are Robins' *A Pocketful of Canada* (1946), Stephens' *The Golden Treasury of Canadian Verse* (1928) and *Canadian Voices and Others* (1943), and Birney's *Twentieth-Century Canadian Poetry* (1953).

121. It is important to note that *A Book of Canadian Prose and Verse* was edited by Edmund and Eleanor Broadus, a fact that speaks to the index of power in heterosexual relationships.

122. Similar data are not available for the 1920s.

123. Kirkconnell was also the chair of the Writers' War Committee, a group organized by the CAA to provide WWII Allies with propaganda.

124. It is significant that the foreword to this *Alberta Poetry Year Book* was written by Emily Murphy, feminist, reformer, judge, politician, and writer.

125. Macbeth was an early practitioner of the freelancer's strategy of publishing the same material in various media. Her travels were the subject of magazine articles, public lecture tours and travel books.

126. "Call My People Home," 1949; "If the World Were Mine," 1950; "Momatkum," 1951; "Edith Sitwell Anthology," 1954; "Our Painters , Writers, and Musicians," 1946; "Poetry and Childhood: The Vision of Edwin Muir," 1960; "Alan Crawley Profile," n.d.; "Signature, A Little Anthology by Dorothy Livesay," 1956; "What is the True Approach to Peace?," 1951.

127. See North, Joseph, Ed. *New Masses: An Anthology of the Rebel Thirties*. Introd. Maxwell Geismar. New York: International, 1969.

Bibliography

Acker, Joan. "The Problem with Patriarchy." *Sociology* 23.2 (May 1989): 235-240.

"Active Service Held Mark of True Patriot" *Montreal Daily Star* 11 Oct. 1941 n.p.

Adeney, Marcus. "The Canadian Predicament." *Canadian Bookman* 12.3 (March 1930): 54-55.

—. "The Future of Canadian Literature." *Canadian Bookman* 10.11 (November 1928): 332-334.

—. "The National Consciousness Idea: A Criticism." *Canadian Bookman* XI.5 (May 1929): 113-116.

Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation)." *Essays on Ideology*. 1971. London: Verso, 1984. 127-186.

Andermahr, Sonya, Terry Lovell, and Carol Wolkowitz. *A Glossary of Feminist Theory*. London: Arnold, 1997.

Anderson, Patrick. "Correspondence." *The Canadian Forum* 24.280 (May 1944): 44.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Commmunities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised Edition. London: Verso, 1991.

Anisef, P. and J. Lennards. "University." *The Canadian Encyclopedia* 3. Edmonton: Hurtig, 1985. 1872-1873.

Arnason, David. "Canadian Poetry: the Interregnum." *CVII: A Quarterly of Canadian Poetry Criticism* 1.1 (Spring 1975): 28-32.

—. "Dorothy Livesay and the Rise of Modernism in Canada." *A Public and Private Voice: Essays on the Life and Work of Dorothy Livesay*. Eds. Lindsay Dorney, Gerald Noonan, Paul Tiessen. Kitchener-Waterloo: University of Waterloo Press, 1988. 5-18.

Banting, Pamela. "Daddy's Girl: Dorothy Livesay's Correspondence with her Father." *Canadian Poetry* 22 (Spring/Summer 1988): 10-21.

Barber, Marsha. "An Interview with Dorothy Livesay." *Room of One's Own: the Dorothy Livesay Issue*. 5.1/2 (1979): 13-34.

Barrett, Michèle and Mary McIntosh. "Christine Delphy: Towards a Materialist

Feminism?" *Feminist Review* 1 (1979): n.p.

Barrett, Michèle. *Women's Oppression Today: Problems in Marxist Feminist Analysis.* London: Verso, 1980.

Beattie, Munro. "Poetry (1935-1950)." *Literary History of Canada: Canadian Literature in English*. 1965. Ed. Carl F. Klinck. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970. 751-784.

Bennett, Ethel Hume. *New Harvesting: Contemporary Canadian Poetry, 1918-1938.* Toronto: Macmillan, 1938.

Benson, Nathaniel A., Ed. *Modern Canadian Poetry*. Ottawa: Graphic, 1930.

Berger, Carl. *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism 1867-1914.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.

Bernheimer, Charles and Claire Kahane, Eds. *In Dora's Case: Freud- Hysteria-Feminism.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.

Birney, Earle, Ed. *Twentieth Century Canadian Poetry*. Toronto: Ryerson, 1953.

Blain, V. P. Clements, I. Grundy. *Feminist Companion to Literature in English*. London: Batsford, 1990.

B.M. rev. of *The White Savannahs* and *New Provinces. The Dalhousie Review* 16 (1936-1937): 543-535.

Bothwell, Austin. rev. of *Shackles* by Madge Macbeth. *Canadian Bookman* 8.10 (October 1926): 308. NAC MG30 D52 Vol.16 File 1926 Loose Clippings.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste.* Trans. Richard Nice. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984.

—. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature.* Ed. Randal Johnson. New York: Columbia Press, 1993.

—. *In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology*. Trans. Matthew Adamson. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990.

—, and Loic J.D. Wacquant. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

—. *The Logic of Practice*. Trans. Richard Nice. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990.

—. *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field.* 1992. Trans. Susan Emanuel. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.

Bradbury, Malcolm, and James McFarlane, Eds. *Modernism: A Guide to European Literature 1890-1930.* 1976. London: Penguin, 1987.

Brandt, Gail Cuthbert. " "Pigeon-Holed and Forgotten": The Work of the Subcommittee on the Post-War Problems of Women, 1943." *Histoire sociale - Social History* 15.29 (mai-May 1982): 239-259.

Broadus, E.K. and E.H., Eds. *A Book of Canadian Prose and Verse.* Toronto: Macmillan, 1923.

Brooker, Bertram, Ed. *Yearbook of the Arts in Canada 1928-1929.* Toronto: Macmillan, 1929.

—. *Yearbook of the Arts in Canada 1936.* Toronto: Macmillan, 1936.

Brown, Esther Lucile. *Social Work as a Profession.* 1935. New York: Arno Press, 1976. Fourth Edition.

Brown, E.K. "A.J.M. Smith and the Poetry of Pride." *Responses and Evaluations: Essays on Canada.* Ed. David Staines. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1977. 83-86.

—. "Canadian Poetry." *Yearbook of the Arts in Canada 1936.* Ed. B.Brooker. Toronto: Macmillan, 1936.

—. *On Canadian Poetry.* Second Edition. Toronto: Ryerson, 1944.

—. *Poetry: A Magazine of Verse, Canadian Number.* 58.1 (April 1941).

—. "I. POETRY (List III)." *The University of Toronto Quarterly* 3 (April 1937): 340-347.

Brooks, Cleanth, Gertrude Himmelfarb, Wilson Moses, and Lionel Abel. "Remaking of the Canon." *Partisan Review* 58.2 (1991): 350-387.

Brubaker, Rogers. "Social Theory as Habitus." *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives.* Eds. Craig Calhoun, Edward LiPuma, Moishe Postone, Eds. Cambridge: Polity, 1993. 212-234.

Burger, Peter. *Theory of the Avant-Garde.* Trans. Michael Shaw. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Buss, Helen. *Mapping Our Selves: Canadian Women's Autobiography in English.* Montreal

& Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993.

Calhoun, Craig. "Habitus, Field, and Capital: The Question of Historical Specificity." Calhoun, Edward LiPuma, and Moishe Postone, Eds. *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993. 61-88.

Campbell, Sandra. "From Romantic History to Communications Theory: Lorne Pierce as Publisher of C.W. Jefferys and Harold Innis" *Journal of Canadian Studies* 30.3 (Automne 1995 Fall): 91-115.

Canada. Bureau of Statistics. *Seventh Census of Canada, 1931*. Volume V. Ottawa: Patenaude, 1935.

—. *Eighth Census of Canada, 1941*. Volume VI. Ottawa: Cloutier, 1946.

"Canadian Traveler and Author Says People Must Realize It's Up toThem to Win War." *Winston-Salem Journal*. n.d. NAC MG30 D52 Vol.14 Scrapbook 1940-1944.

Canadian Authors Association, Eds. *Canadian Poems*. Calgary: CAA, 1937.

—. *Manitoba Poetry Chapbook*. Winnipeg: Israelite Press, 1933.

—. *Poetry Year Book 1928-1929*. Montreal: CAA, 1929.

—. *Poetry Year Book 1929-1930*. Montreal: CAA, 1930.

—. *Poetry Year Book 1930-1931*. Montreal: CAA, 1931.

—. *Poetry Year Book 1939*. Montreal: CAA, 1939.

—. *Poetry Year Book 1940*. Montreal: CAA, 1940.

—. *Profile: A Chapbook of Canadian Verse*. Ottawa: CAA, 1946.

—. *Voices of Victory: Representative Poetry of Canada in War-time*. Toronto: CAA, 1941.

Canby, Henry Seidel. *American Memoir*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1947.

Candidus. "Have We A Literature in Canada?" *The Toronto Star Weekly* 25 June 1910: 7.

Carr, Graham. "'All We North Americans': Literary Culture and the Continentalist Ideal, 1919-1939." *American Review of Canadian Studies* 17.2 (1987): 145-157.

Carr-Saunders, A.M. and P.A. Wilson. *The Professions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Cecil-Smith, E. "What is 'Pure' Art?" *Masses* 1.4-5 (July-August 1932): n.p.

Chen, Kuan-Hsing. "Cultural Studies and the Politics of Internationalization: An

Interview with Stuart Hall." *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. Eds. David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen. London: Routledge, 1996. 392-408.

Clarke, George Herbert. *The New Treasury of War Poetry: Poems of the Second World War*. Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1943.

Cole, Douglas. "The Problem of "Nationalism" and "Imperialism" in British Settlement Colonies." *Journal of British Studies* 10 (1971): 160-182.

Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837*. 1992. London: Pimlico, 1994.

Craig, Terrence. "Watson Kirkconnell." *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Literature*. Second Edition. Eds. E. Benson, W. Toye. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1997. 597-598.

Creighton, Alan and Hilda M. Ridley, Eds. *A New Canadian Anthology*. Toronto: Crucible Press, 1938.

Curtis, T.L. "The Life and Times of a Literary Chameleon: Madge Hamilton Lyons Macbeth." Unpublished thesis. University of Guelph, 1996.

Dagg, Anne Innis. *The 50% Solution: Why Should Women Pay for Men's Culture?* Waterloo: Otter Press, 1986.

Davey, Frank. "Canadian Canons." *Critical Inquiry* 16 (Spring 1990): 672-681.

Davis, Angela Y. *Women, Race & Class*. New York: Random House, 1981.

Deacon, William Arthur. *Poteen: A Pot-Pourri of Canadian Essays*. Ottawa: Graphic, 1926.

---. "The Worm Squirms." rev. of *Shackles* by Madge Macbeth. Saturday Night Literary Section. NAC MG30 D52 Vol.16 File 1926 Loose Clippings.

Dean, Misao. *A Different Point of View: Sara Jeannette Duncan*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991.

Dehli, Kari. "Women in the Community: Reform of Schooling and Motherhood in Toronto." *Community Organization and the Canadian State*. Eds. Roxana Ng, Gillian Walker, Jacob Muller. Toronto: Garamond, 1990. 47-64.

DeKoven, Marianne. "Gendered Doubleness and the `Origins' of Modernist Form." *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 8.1 (Spring 1989): 19-42.

Delphy, Christine. *Close to Home: A materialist analysis of women's oppression*. Trans.-Ed.

Diana Leonard. London: Hutchinson, 1984.

Denison, Merrill. "Nationalism and Drama." *Yearbook of the Arts in Canada 1928-1929.* Ed. Bertram Brooker. Toronto: Macmillan, 1929. 51-55.

Devereux, Cecily. "New Woman, New World: Maternal Feminism and the New Imperialism in the White Settler Colonies." *Women's Studies International Forum* 22.2: 175-184.

DiBattista, Maria. "Introduction," *High and Low Moderns: Literature and Culture, 1889-1939.* Eds. Maria DiBattista and Lucy McDiarmid. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Dickens, V.I. "Women Authors at the C.N.E." *Canadian Bookman* August 1925: 133.

Djwa, Sandra. "'A New Soil and a Sharp Sun': the Landscape of a Modern Canadian Poetry." *Modernist Studies* 2.2 (1977): 3-17.

Doyle, James. "Literary Magazines and the Cosmopolitanism/ Nationalism Debate in Canada." *Context North America: Canadian/U.S. Literary Relations.* Ed. Camile R. La Bossière. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1994. 97-105.

Dreisziger, N.F. "Watson Kirkconnell and the Cultural Credibility Gap Between Immigrants and the Native-Born in Canada." *Ethnic Canadians: Culture and Education.* Ed. Martin L. Kovacs. Regina: Canadian Plains Research Center, 1978. 87-96.

Dykk, Lloyd. "A Gallant Poet Speaks Her Mind." *The Vancouver Sun* 11 Sept. 1981: L40+.

Eayrs, Carl, Ed. *Border Voices: A Collection of Poems.* Windsor: Canadian Authors Association, 1946.

Ebert, Teresa. "After Transnationalism and Localism: Toward A Red Feminism." *Against the Current* September/October n.d.: 27-31.

—. "Ludic Feminism, the Body, Performance, and Labor: Bringing *Materialism* Back into Feminist Cultural Studies." *Cultural Critique* Winter 1992-1993: 5-50.

—. "Writing in the Political: Resistance (Post)modernism." *Legal Studies Forum* 15.4 (1991): 291-303.

Elliott, Bridget and Jo-Ann Wallace. *Women Artists and Writers: Modernist (im)positionings*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Elshtain, Jean Bethke. "Sovereignty, Identity, Sacrifice." *Millennium Journal of International Studies* 20.3 (1991): 395-406.

Endres, Robin. "Marxist Literary Criticism and English Canadian Literature." *In Our Own House: Social Perspectives on Canadian Literature*. Ed. Paul Cappon. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978. 82-129.

Fairley, Margaret, Ed. *Spirit of Canadian Democracy: A Collection of Canadian Writings from the Beginnings to the Present Day*. Toronto: Progress, n.d. [1945]

Fee, Margery. "English-Canadian Literary Criticism, 1890-1950: Defining and Establishing a National Literature." Diss. University of Toronto, 1981.

Ferguson, Ann. "The Intersection of Race, Gender, and Class in the United States Today." *Rethinking MARXISM* 3.3-4 (Fall-Winter 1990(: 45-64.

Finn, Geraldine. "Why Althusser Killed His Wife." *Canadian Forum* September-October 1981: 28-29.

Flexner, Eleanor. *Century of Struggle: The Woman's Rights Movement in the United States*. Revised Edition. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1975.

Forsyth, Louise. "Drama in French 1900-1948." *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Literature*. Second Edition. Eds. Eugene Benson, William Toye. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1997. 312-317.

Fowler, Bridget. *Pierre Bourdieu and Cultural Theory: Critical Investigations*. London: Sage, 1997.

Freeman, Barbara. "Mother and Son: Gender, Class, and War Propaganda in Canada, 1939-1945." *American Journalism* 12.3 (Summer 1995): 260-275.

Friedson, Eliot. *Professionalism Reborn: Theory, Prophecy, and Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Garvin, John W., Ed. *Canadian Poets*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1926.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983.

Gerson, Carole. "The Business of a Woman's Life: Money and Motive in the Careers of

Early Canadian Women Writers." *Women's Writing and the Literary Institution/L'écriture au féminin et l'institution littéraire*. Towards a History of the Literary Institution in Canada: 6th Conference. Eds. C. Potvin and J. Williamson. Edmonton: Research Institute for Comparative Literature, 1992. 77-94.

—. "Anthologies and the Canon of Early Canadian Women Writers." *Re(Dis)covering Our Foremothers: Nineteenth-Century Canadian Women Writers*. Ed. Lorraine McMullen. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1989. 55-76.

—. "The Canon between the Wars: Field-notes of a Feminist Literary Archaeologist." *Canadian Canons: Essays in Literary Value*. Ed. R. Lecker. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991. 46-56.

Gibbon, J.M. "Where is Canadian Literature?" *The Canadian Magazine* L.4 (February 1918): 333-340.

Gnarowski, Michael, Ed. *New Provinces: Poems of Several Authors*. 1936. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.

Godard, Barbara. "Epi(pro)logue: In Pursuit of the Long Poem." *Open Letter, Long-liners' Conference Issue* Sixth Series, Nos. 2-3 (Summer-Fall 1985): 301-335.

Goldberg, David Theo. *Racist Culture: Philosophy and the Politics of Meaning*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.

Golding, Alan C. "A History of American Poetry Anthologies." Canons 1983. Ed. Robert von Hallberg. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1984. 279-307.

Grant, George. *Lament for a Nation: The Defeat of Canadian Nationalism*. 1965. Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1991.

Griffin, Gabriele, Ed. *Difference in View: Women and Modernism*. London: Taylor and Francis, 1994.

Grove, F.P. *It Needs To Be Said*. 1929 Introduction W.J. Keith. Ottawa: Tecumseh, 1982.

—. "Assimilation." *A Stranger to My Time: Essays by and about Frederick Philip Grove*. Ed. Paul Hjartarson. Edmonton: NeWest Press, 1987. 177-187.

Guillory, John. *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Gustafson, Ralph, Ed. *Anthology of Canadian Poetry* (1942). Toronto: Penguin, 1942.

—. *Canadian Accent: A Collection of Stories and Poems by Contemporary Writers from Canada*. New York: Penguin, 1944.

Hambleton, Ronald, Ed. *Unit of Five*. Toronto: Ryerson, 1944.

Hamilton, C.C. "Why of the 'Help' Problem." *Canadian Courier* 18 Jan 1913: 16.

Harding, Sandra. "Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What is "Strong Objectivity?"" *The Centennial Review* 36.3 (Fall 1992): 437-470.

Harrington, Lyn. *Syllables of Recorded Time: The Story of the Canadian Authors Association 1921-1981*. Toronto: Simon & Pierre, 1981.

Heggie, Grace and Anne McGaughey. *Index to Canadian Bookman*. Toronto: McLaren Editions, 1993.

Henley, Kevin. "The International Roots of Economic Nationalist Ideology in Canada, 1846-1885." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 24.4 (Hiver 1989-1990 Winter): 107-121.

Hennessy, Rosemary. *Materialist Feminism and the Politics of Discourse*. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Hill, Maude Petitt. "What's the Matter with Housework?" *Chatelaine* March 1928: 13, 56.

Hillmer, Norman. "Statute of Westminster." *The Canadian Encyclopedia* Volume III. Edmonton: Hurtig, 1985. 1756.

Hobsbawm, E.J. *Nations and nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth, reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Horn, Michiel. *The League for Social Reconstruction: Intellectual Origins of the Democratic Left in Canada 1930-1942*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980.

Humm, Maggie. *The Dictionary of Feminist Theory*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1990.

Hundleby, Catherine. "Material Dimensions of Oppositional Consciousness in Feminist Standpoint Theory." Paper presented to *(The) Concrete Matters: Feminist Materialism across the Disciplines*, University of Alberta, Edmonton, March 5-7, 1998

Huyssen, Andreas. *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism*.

Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1986.

Hyman, Roger Leslie. "Wasted Heritage and *Waste Heritage:* The Critical Disregard of an Important Canadian Novel." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 17.4 (Hiver 1982-83 Winter): 74-87.

Ignatieff, Michael. *Blood and Belonging: Journeys Into The New Nationalism*. Toronto: Penguin, 1993.

Irvine, Dean J., Ed. *Archive for Our Times: Previously Uncollected and Unpublished Poems of Dorothy Livesay*. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 1998.

Isajiw, Wsevolod. "Definitions of Ethnicity." *Ethnicity and Ethnic Relations in Canada.* Eds. Rita M. Bienvenue and Jay E. Goldstein. Toronto: Butterworth, 1985. 5-17.

Jackson, Stevi. *Christine Delphy*. London: Sage, 1996.

Jaques, Edna. *The Best of Edna Jaques*. Saskatoon: Western Producer Book Service, 1974.

Jenkins, Richard. *Pierre Bourdieu*. 1992. London: Routledge, 1998.

Johnston, A.J.B. "Nativism in Nova Scotia: Anti-Irish Ideology in a Mid-Nineteenth-Century British Colony." *The Irish in Atlantic Canada 1780-1900*. Ed. Thomas P. Power. Fredericton: New Ireland Press, 1991. 23-29.

Jones, Heather. "Macbeth, Madge (Hamilton)." *Twentieth-Century Romance and Historical Writers* Second Edition. Chicago and London: St. James Press, 416-417.

Kaufmann, Michael. "Gendering Modernism: H.D., Imagism, and Masculinist Aesthetics." *Unmanning Modernism: Gendered Re-Readings*. Eds. Elizabeth Jane Harrison and Shirley Peterson. Knoxville: Tennessee University Press, 1997. 59-72.

Kennedy, Leo. "Direction for Canadian Poets." 1936. *The McGill Movement: A.J.M. Smith, F.R. Scott and Leo Kennedy*. Ed. Peter Stevens. Toronto: Ryerson, 1969. 11-19.

Kenner, Hugh. "The Making of the Modernist Canon." *Canons* 1983. Ed. Robert von Hallberg. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1984. 363-375.

Knister, Raymond. "Canadian Letter." [1923] *The First Day of Spring: Stories and Other Prose*. Selected and Introduced by Peter Stevens. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976. 377-382.

—. rev. of *Shackles* by Madge Macbeth. *The Canadian Magazine* April 1927: 42.

Kokotailo, Philip. "The Bishop and His Deacon: Smith vs. Sutherland Reconsidered." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 27.2 (Eté 1992 Summer): 63-81.

Kristeva, Julia. *Nations Without Nationalism.* Trans. Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

Lacombe, Michele. "Theosophy and the Canadian Idealist Tradition: A Preliminary Exploration." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 17.2 (Eté 1982 Summer): 100-118.

Larson, Sarfatti Magali. *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

Lauter, Paul. "Race and Gender in the Shaping of the American Literary Canon: A Case Study from the Twenties." *Feminist Studies* 9.3 (Fall 1983): 435-463.

Lawson, Alan. "Postcolonial Theory and the 'Settler' Subject." *Essays on Canadian Writing* 56 (Fall 1995): 20-36.

Lecker, Robert, Ed. *Canadian Canons: Essays in Literary Value.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991.

—. "The Canonization of Canadian Literature: An Inquiry into Value." *Critical Inquiry* 16 (Spring 1990): 656-671.

—. "Response to Frank Davey." *Critical Inquiry* 16 (Spring 1990): 682-689.

—. "Watson and Pierce's *Our Canadian Literature* Anthology and the Representation of Nation." *Canadian Poetry* 38 (Spring/Summer 1996): 49-87.

Lerner, Adam J. Rev. of *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780* by E.J. Hobsbawm. *Millennium Journal of International Studies* 20.3 (1991): 537-539.

LiPuma, Edward. "Culture and the Concept of Culture in a Theory of Practice." Craig Calhoun, Edward LiPuma, Moishe Postone, Eds. *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives.* Cambridge: Polity, 1993. 14-34.

Livesay, Dorothy. "A Better Break for the Indian." *The Star Weekly* 2 Oct.1948, Section 1: 2.

—. "Canada's East Indians." *The Star Weekly* 12 July 1947, Section 2: 7.

—. "Canada's Japanese `Problem'." *The Star Weekly* 29 March 1947: 4.

—. "Canada's Partly Opened Door." *The Star Weekly* 2 Aug 1947: 3.

—. "Correspondence." *The Canadian Forum* 24.282 (July 1944): 89.

—. *The Documentaries.* Toronto: Ryerson, 1968.

—. "The Documentary Poem: A Canadian Genre." *Contexts of Canadian Criticism.* Ed. Eli Mandel. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971. 267-279.

—. "The early days." *The Canadian Forum* April-May 1970: 34-36.

—. *Green Pitcher.* Toronto: Macmillan, 1928.

—. "John Brown's Body and the Canadian Civil War." *Privateer* October 18, 1929: 11-12.

—. Letter to J.F.B. Livesay, January 25, 1929. University of Manitoba Archives MSS 37 Box 37 Folder 2.

—. Letter to the Editor of *Saturday Night.* University of Alberta, Special Collections Library, 96-69, Queen's Box 2, File 25, April 6, 1949.

—. "An Open Letter to Sir Charles G.D. Roberts." *The Canadian Bookman* April/May 1939: 34.

—. "Open Letter to Marsha Barber." *Room of One's Own, The Dorothy Livesay Issue* 5.1/2 (1979): 35-

—. *Right Hand Left Hand* Erin, Ontario: Press Porcepic, 1977.

—. "This Canadian Poetry." *The Canadian Forum* 24.279 (April 1944): 20-21.

—. *The Self-Completing Tree: Selected Poems.* Victoria and Toronto: Press Porcépic, 1986.

—. *Journey with My Selves: A Memoir 1909-1963.* Vancouver and Toronto: Douglas & McIntyre, 1991.

—, Ed. *Collected Poems of Raymond Knister.* Toronto: Ryerson, 1949.

— and Seymour Mayne, Eds. *40 Women Poets of Canada.* Montreal: Ingluvin, 1971.

—, Ed. *Woman's Eye: 12 B.C. Poets.* Vancouver: Air, 1978.

Livesay, Florence Randal. "Canadian Poetry Today." *Poetry: A Magazine of Verse* 27.1 (October 1925-March 1926): 36-40.

—, Trans. *Down Singing Centuries: Folk Literature of the Ukraine.* Ed. Louisa Loeb. Winnipeg: Hyperion, 1981.

—. *Shepherd's Purse.* Toronto: Macmillan, 1923.

Logan, J.D. "Teaching Canadian Literature in the Universities." *Canadian Bookman*

December 1920: 61-62.

—. and Donald G. French. *Highways of Canadian Literature: A Synoptic Introduction to the Literary History of Canada (English) from 1760 to 1924*. 1924. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1928. Second Edition.

E.M. "A Builder of Canada." *The Canadian Bookman* 11.4 (April 1929): 83-84.

M. "Literature and Life, A Booklover's Corner." *The Ottawa Journal* Saturday, October 23, 1926, n.p. NAC MG59 VOL

Macbeth, Madge. "Au Revoir Juliana!" *Mayfair* November 1944: 26-27+.

—. *Boulevard Career*. Toronto: Kingswood, 1957.

—. "Canada Signs Her Name" Book Week Broadcast, November 8, 1939. Macbeth Papers, CACRCO MG59 Vol.2 File 23.

—. "Enter the Debutante." *Canadian Courier Woman's Supplement* 28 December 1912: 15.

—. "Has Canada a Literature? Yes!" Speech to the Women's Canadian Club, London, Ontario, 1924. Macbeth Papers, Municipal Archives of Ottawa (CACRCO) MG59 Vol.2 File 13.

—. "How Much Sex Should Be Put in Novels?" *Saturday Night* 62 (March 22, 1947): 23.

—. "A New Psychological Approach to Home-Keeping is Needed." *Saturday Night* 59 (15 April 1944): 38.

—. *Over the Gangplank to Spain*. Ottawa: Graphic, 1931.

—. *The Patterson Limit*. Toronto: Hodder and Stoughton: [1923].

—. "Raise Her Status and the Worker May Return to the House." *Saturday Night* 59 (22 April 1944): 32.

—. *Shackles*. Ottawa: Graphic, 1926.

—. *Shreds of Circumstance*. London: Allen, 1947.

—. "'Until Love Dies' Or the Courts Us Do Part." *The Chatelaine* 1 (November 1928): 3-4+.

—. *Volcano: A Novel of the Ecuadorean Andes*. Philadelphia: Dorrance, 1963.

MacLean, Kate Seymour. "Education and National Sentiment." *The Search for English-Canadian Literature: An Anthology of Critical Articles from the Nineteenth and Early*

Twentieth Centuries. Ed. Carl Ballstadt. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975. 98-107.

McClintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.

McClung, Nellie. *Purple Springs*. 1921. Introd. Randi R. Warne. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.

Machar, Agnes [Fidelis]. "Patriotism Versus Cosmopolitanism." *The Week* 7 Oct. 1886: 716.

McCullagh, Joan. *Alan Crawley and Contemporary Verse*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1976.

McInnis, Edgar. "The Disturbed Muse." *The Canadian Forum* 16.187 (August 1936): 29.

MacLure, Millar. "Literary Scholarship." *Literary History of Canada: Canadian Literature in English*. 1965. Ed. Carl F. Klinck. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970. 529-550.

MacMechan, Archibald. *Headwaters of Canadian Literature*. 1924. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1974.

McNaught, Kenneth. "The 1930s." *The Canadians 1867-1967: Part One*. 1968. Eds. J.M.S. Careless, R. Craig Brown. Toronto: Macmillan, 1976. 236-274.

MacNeice, Louis. *Poems 1925-1940*. New York: Random House, 1940. 131.

Mintz, Helen and Barbara Coward. "Being a Writer in the Thirties: an interview with Dorothy Livesay." *This Magazine* 7.4 (January 1974): 19-21.

Moloughney, Bill. "The Moloughney Story." Ms. Dorval, Québec.

Moi, Toril. "Appropriating Bourdieu: Feminist Theory and Pierre Bourdieu's Sociology of Culture." *New Literary History* 22 (1991): 1017-1049.

Moore, Robert. "Reading Between the Canon and the Curriculum: Issues of Legibility and Legitimacy." *English Studies in Canada* 17.4 (December 1991): 421-435.

Moyles, R.G. and Doug Owram. *Imperial Dreams and Colonial Realities: British Views of Canada, 1880-1914*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.

Mulvihill, James. "The 'Canadian Bookman' and Literary Nationalism." *Canadian*

Literature 107 (1985): 48-59.

Murray, Heather. "From Canon to Curriculum." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 60.2 (Winter 1990/1): 229-243.

Nairn, Tom. "Demonising Nationalism." *London Review of Books* 25 February 1993: 4-6.

—. *Faces of Nationalism: Janus Revisited.* New York: Verso, 1997.

Ng, Roxana. "Sexism, racism and Canadian nationalism." *Feminism and the Politics of Difference.* Eds. S. Gunew, A. Yeatman. Halifax: Fernwood, 1993: 197-211.

Norris, Ken. *The Little Magazine in Canada 1925-1980: Its Role in the Development of Modernism and Post-Modernism in Canadian Poetry.* Toronto: ECW Press, 1984.

Ostenso, Martha. *Wild Geese.* 1925. Afterword D. Arnason. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1990.

O'Toole, Bridget. "Canada at the 1948 Olympic Games." *The Inside Track* CBC Radio. 21 December 1997.

Pacey, Desmond, Ed. *The Letters of Frederick Philip Grove.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.

—. "Fiction (1920-1940)." *Literary History of Canada: Canadian Literature in English.* Ed. Carl F. Klinck. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970. 658-693.

Parker, George L. "Authors and Their Milieu." *The Canadian Encyclopedia Volume 1.* Edmonton: Hurtig, 1985. 115-116.

Patriarche, Mrs. Valance. Letter. *The Canadian Bookman* July 1925: 116.

Peterson, Shirley. "Modernism, Single Motherhood, and the Discourse of Women's Liberation in Rebecca West's *The Judge.*" *Unmanning Modernism: Gendered Re-Readings.* Eds. Elizabeth Jane Harrison and Shirley Peterson. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997. 105-116.

Pierce, Lorne. "Canadian Literature and the National Ideal." *The Canadian Bookman* 7.9 (September 1925): 143-144.

Prentice, Alison et al. *Canadian Women: A History.* Second Edition. Toronto: Harcourt Brace, 1996.

Punch, Terence M. "Anti-Irish Prejudice in Nineteenth-Century Nova Scotia: The

Literary and Statistical Evidence." *The Irish in Atlantic Canada 1780-1900*. Ed. Thomas P. Power. Fredericton: New Ireland Press, 1991. 13-22.

Quigley, Carroll. "The Round Table Groups in Canada, 1908-38." *Canadian Historical Review* 43.3 (September 1962): 204-224.

Relke, Diana M. "The Actualities of Experience: Constance Lindsay Skinner's Indian Poems." *Atlantis* 14.2 (Spring 1989): 10-20.

Richardson, T. "In Defense of Pure Art." *Masses* 1.4-5 (July-August 1932): n.p.

Roberts, Barbara. "Ladies, Women and the State: Managing Female Immigration, 1880-1920." *Community Organization and the Canadian State*. Eds. Roxana Ng, Gillian Walker, Jacob Muller. Toronto: Garamond, 1990. 108-130.

Roberts, Sir Charles G.D. and Arthur Leonard Tunnell, Eds. *The Canadian Who's Who* Vol.2 1936-37. Toronto: Murray, 1936.

Robertson, Heather. "Dorothy Livesay: "My aim was to merge the political and the lyrical. I'm an unabashed romantic."." *Quill & Quire* 49.3 (March 1983): 4+

Robins, John D., Ed. *A Pocketful of Canada*. Toronto: Collins, 1946.

Rodney, William. *Soldiers of the International: A History of the Communist Party of Canada, 1919-1929*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968.

Sandwell, B.K. "Standards of Criticism." *Canadian Bookman* 2 (April 1919): 7-8.

—. "Tilling a Narrow Field." *The Canadian Bookman* 4.2 (January 1922): 37-38.

Sangster, Joan. *Dreams of Equality: Women on the Canadian Left, 1920-1950*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1989.

Saul, John Ralston. *Reflections of a Siamese Twin: Canada at the End of the Twentieth Century*. Toronto: Viking-Penguin, 1997.

Scott, D.C. "Poetry and Progress." *The Circle of Affection and Other Pieces in Prose and Verse*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1947. 123-147.

Scott, F.R. "The Canadian Authors Meet." *The McGill Fortnightly Review* 27 April 1927: 73.

—. "Letter to the Editor, *The Gazette* 1931." *A New Endeavour: Selected Political Essays, Letters and Addresses*. Ed. Michiel Horn. Toronto: University of Toronto Press,

1986. 3-4.

—. *A New Endeavour: Selected Political Essays, Letters and Addresses.* Ed. Michiel Horn. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.

—. "New Poems for Old - 1.- The Decline of Poesy." *The Canadian Forum* 11.128 (May 1931): 296-298).

—. Papers. National Archives of Canada. MG30 D211. *New Provinces* File: Volume 1, Microfilm Reel H1211.

—. Rev. of *Day and Night* by Dorothy Livesay. *First Statement* 2.10 (December 1944-January 1945): 23-24.

–. *Selected Poems.* Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Scruton, Roger. *A Dictionary of Political Thought.* London: Macmillan, 1982.

Shiach, Morag. "'Cultural studies' and the work of Pierre Bourdieu." *French Cultural Studies* 4.3 (October 1993): 213-223.

"Significance of Canadian Book Week." *Canadian Bookman* December 1925: 201.

Singer, Peter. *Marx.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Skinner, Constance Lindsay. Letters to Madge Macbeth. Macbeth Papers National Archives of Canada MG30 D52, File: Correspondence 1924.

—. "Wanted-A Literature." *The Literary Review* January 5, 1924: 419.

—. "Stefansson, Sentinel of Civilization." *The Canadian Forum* 7 (October 1926): 398-401.

Slack, Jennifer Daryl. "The Theory and Method of Articulation in Cultural Studies." *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies.* Eds. David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen. London: Routledge, 1996. 112-127.

Smith, Anthony D. "The Nation: Invented, Imagined, Reconstructed?" *Millennium Journal of International Studies* 20.3 (1991): 353-368.

Smith, A.J.M., Ed. *The Book of Canadian Poetry: A Critical and Historical Anthology* First Edition. Toronto: Gage, 1943.

—. *The Book of Canadian Poetry: A Critical and Historical Anthology* Second Edition. Toronto: Gage, 1948.

—. *The Book of Canadian Poetry: A Critical and Historical Anthology* Third Edition.

Toronto: Gage, 1957.

—. "Canadian Anthologies, New and Old." 1942. *On Poetry and Poets: Selected Essays of A.J.M. Smith*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977. 1-18.

—. "The Confessions of a Compulsive Anthologist." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 11.2 (May 1976): 4-14.

—. "The Lonely Land." *Canadian Poetry Volume One*. Eds. Jack David and Robert Lecker. Toronto: Stoddard, 1982. 162-163.

—. "A Rejected Preface." *Canadian Literature* 24 (1965): 6-9.

—. "Wanted-Canadian Criticism." *The Canadian Forum* 8.91 (April 1928): 600-601.

Smith, Denis. "Nationalism." *The Canadian Encyclopedia* 2. Edmonton: Hurtig, 1985. 1199-1200.

Smith, Dorothy E. *The Conceptual Practices of Power: A Feminist Sociology of Knowledge*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

Sollors, Werner. *Beyond Ethnicity: Consent and Descent in American Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Sparke, Penny. *As Long As It's Pink: The Sexual Politics of Taste*. London: Harper Collins, 1995.

"Speaker Urges Every 'Possible Sacrifice, Every Aid For Britain.'" *Winnipeg Tribune* 29 Oct. 1941. n.p. See also NAC MG30 D52 Vol.14 Scrapbook 1940-1944.

Staines, David. *Beyond the Provinces: Literary Canada at Century's End*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995.

Stasiulis, Daiva, and Radha Jhappan. "The Fractious Politics of a Settler Society." *Unsettling Settler Societies: Articulations of Gender, Race, Ethnicity and Class*. Eds. Daiva Stasiulis and Nira Yuval-Davis. London: Sage, 1995. 95-131.

Stephen, A.M., Ed. *The Golden Treasury of Canadian Verse*. Toronto: Dent, 1928.

Strong-Boag, Veronica. *The New Day Recalled: Lives of Girls and Women in English Canada, 1919-1939*. Toronto: Copp Clark, 1988.

Struthers, James. *No Fault of Their Own: Unemployment and the Canadian Welfare State 1914-1941*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983.

Sutherland, Fraser. *The Monthly Epic: A History of Canadian Magazines.* Markham, Ontario: Fitzhenry & Whiteside, 1989.

Sutherland, John. "Mr. Smith and the Tradition; Introduction to *Other Canadians.*" *The Making of Modern Poetry in Canada.* Eds. Louis Dudek, Michael Gnarowski. Toronto: Ryerson, 1967. 47-61.

—, Ed. *Other Canadians: An Anthology of the New Poetry in Canada 1940-1946.* n.p., n.d. [First Statement Press, 1947]

Thompson, John Herd and Allen Seager. *Canada 1922-1939: Decades of Discord.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1985.

Thompson, Lee Briscoe. *Dorothy Livesay.* Boston: G.K. Hall, 1987.

Thornton, M.V. "Virile Work of Canadian Poet." np. nd. Clipping. Mss 37 Box 18 Folder 3. The Dorothy Livesay Collection, Department of Archives and Special Collections, University of Manitoba Libraries, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

"Thumbnail History of the *Canadian Author & Bookman.*" *Canadian Author and Bookman* n.p. n.d. [1962]: 18-19.

Tippett, Maria. *Making Culture: English-Canadian Institutions and the Arts before the Massey Commission.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

Tomkins, G.S. "Curriculum Development." *The Canadian Encyclopedia.* 1. Edmonton: Hurtig, 1985. 458-459.

Toren, Nina. *Social Work: The Case of a Semi-Profession.* Beverly Hills: Sage, 1972.

Trehearne, Brian. *Aestheticism and the Canadian Modernists: Aspects of a Poetic Influence.* Kingston, Montreal, London: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1989.

Trudeau, P.E.T. *Against the Current: Selected Writings 1939-1996.* Ed. Gerard Pelletier. Trans. George Tombs. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1996.

Vance, Jonathan. *Death So Noble: Memory, Meaning, and the First World War.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1997.

Vernon, Lorraine. "Forty women poets redress balance." *The Vancouver Sun* 13 Oct.1972: 37A.

Vipond, Mary. *National Consciousness in English-Speaking Canada in the 1920's: Seven*

Studies. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Toronto, 1974.

—. "The Canadian Authors' Association in the 1920s: A Case Study in Cultural Nationalism." *Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue d'étude canadiennes* 15.1 (Printemps 1980 Spring): 68-79.

—."The Nationalist Network.: English Canada's Intellectuals and Artists in the 1920s." *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism* 7 (1980): 32-52.

"Voluntary System Held Failure Here." *Montreal Gazette* 11 Oct. 1941, n.p. See also NAC Madge Macbeth Papers MG30 D52 Vol.14 Scrapbook 1940-1944.

Wacquant, Loic J.D. "Bourdieu in America: Notes on the Transatlantic Importation of Social Theory." *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives*. Eds. Craig Calhoun, Edward LiPuma, Moishe Postone. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993. 235-262.

Waddington, Miriam. *Apartment Seven: Essays Selected and New*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Wagner, Anton. "Elsie Park Gowan: Distinctively Canadian." *Theatre History in Canada/Histoire du Théâtre au Canada* 8.1 (Spring 1987): 68-82.

Walby, Sylvia. "Theorising Patriarchy." *Sociology* 23.2 (May 1989): 213-234.

Wallace, W.Stewart. *The Growth of Canadian Nationalism*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1927.

Waters, Malcolm. "Patriarchy and Viriarchy: An Exploration and Reconstruction of Concepts of Masculine Domination." *Sociology* 23.2 (May 1989): 193-211.

Weir, E. Austin. *The Struggle for National Broadcasting in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1965.

West, Lois, Ed. *Feminist Nationalism*. New York: Routledge, 1997.

—. "Feminist Nationalist Social Movements: Beyond Universalism and Towards a Gendered Cultural Relativism." *Women's Studies International Forum* 15.5/6 (1992): 563-579.

White, Syd. "Letter to the Editor of the *New York Evening Post*." Macbeth Papers. NAC MG30 D52 Vol.2 File: Correspondence 1924 #994.

Whiteman, Bruce. "The Early History of the Macmillan Company of Canada, 1905-1921." *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of Canada* 23 (1984): 68-81.

The Who. "My Generation." Online. Available at <http://www.thewho.net>. January 13, 1999.

Williams, Raymond. *Keywords*. 1976. London: Fontana, 1988.

Wilson, Fiona and Bodil Folke Frederiksen, Eds. *Ethnicity, Gender and the Subversion of Nationalism*. London: Cass, 1995.

Wolff, Janet. "The Invisible *Flâneuse:* Women and the Literature of Modernity." *Theory Culture and Society* 2.3 (1985): 37-46.

"Women's War Campaign Quarters Will Remain Open Next Week." *The Citizen* [Ottawa] 13 July 1940 n.p.

Woodcock, George. "*Contemporary Verse* (1941-1952)." *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Literature* Second Edition. Eds. Eugene Benson, William Toye. Don Mills: Oxford University Press, 1997.

The Writers' Craft Club, Eds. *A Sheaf of Verse*. Toronto: Ryerson, 1929.

Young, David. "The Macmillan Company of Canada in the 1930s." *Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue d'études canadiennes* 30.3 (Automne 1995 Fall): 117-133.

Young, Walter D. "The CCF and the Communist Party." *The Anatomy of a Party: The National CCF 1932-1961*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969. 254-284.

Yuval-Davis, Nira and Floya Anthias, Eds. *Woman-Nation-State*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989.

Zach, Natan. "Imagism and Vorticism." *Modernism: A Guide to European Literature 1890-1930*. 1976. Eds. Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane. London: Penguin, 1987. 228-242.